PRESENTED
BY
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND BOOK SOCIETY
11. ADAM STREET, LONDON.

PRESENTED
BY THE
Church of England
Book Society,
11, ADAM STREET, LONDON.
FOUNDED 1880.

Treasurer.
FRANK A. BEVAN, ESQ.

Secretary.
JOHN SHRIMPTON, ESQ.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/papersondoctrine00londuoft

R Theol P

PAPERS

ON THE

Doctrine of the English Church,

CONCERNING

THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE.

BY

AN ENGLISH PRESBYTER.

LONDON:
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND BOOK SOCIETY,
11, ADAM STREET.

3340
19/5/90

INTRODUCTION.

Controversy, in these days, is a necessity. To enter upon it from a love of controversy is not.

There is something very sad and humbling in the thought, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper—the Communion of His Body and Blood—the Feast of His dying love, should ever be, among those who are called His disciples, an occasion of envying, strifes, debates.

And yet for what they were persuaded to be the truth in this matter, our Reformers, we know, earnestly contended and resisted unto blood.

If, indeed, they had God's truth on their side, a necessity was laid upon them. And if so, not on them alone, but on us also, is necessity laid, to contend for that truth which they taught and left as an heritage to us.

And, at this time, it seems that there is an especial need to clear both the teaching of our Reformers and of the Formularies of our Church from misconceptions, which are occasioning anxiety, and perplexity, and much danger to the minds of many.

It is with this object that these Papers are sent forth.

The writer professes to start with a very strong conviction, that what is called "The Doctrine of the Real Objective Presence," was *not* the teaching of our Reformers, and is *not* the doctrine of our Church.

Not only so; he believes the grounds on which his convictions rest are so clear and firm, that he cannot but desire to ask those whose views may have been tending in an opposite direction to pause and reconsider this subject. Nay, more: he feels con-

strained even to beg of those, (and he hopes he may do so without offence,) who have already given in their verdict against his judgment, to go with him over the ground afresh, and carefully observe the position and bearings of the landmarks which our Reformers have set up, and left for us to maintain and defend.

At the same time, he enters on this work not without a feeling in unison with the fears of those, who viewing especially the dangers on the other side, are very anxious to shun the error which would reduce the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to mere signs. And he desires to disclaim sympathy with any views which would despoil these "holy mysteries" of any portion of their great "dignity," robbing "the bread which we break" of its effectual power, through the Communion of the Body of Christ, inwardly to strengthen man's heart, and emptying "the cup of blessing" of its exceeding blessedness, as the Communion of the Blood of Christ, to the souls of His faithful people.

And towards those whom he is, of necessity, opposing in this view of our Church's teaching, he desires, not only very earnestly to disclaim any personal feeling, but also very carefully to avoid any language which may be calculated to provoke bitterness, or wrath, or anger; being assured that the cause of truth needs not the support of human passions, and being anxious to avoid all such weapons as are not weapons of Christian warfare, desiring indeed, if by God's mercy it may be so, so to write as to attract rather than to repel.

Further, he would desire not only himself to pray, but most earnestly to beg the prayers of others, that the God of all mercy may pardon all errors and imperfections in this work; that the God of all peace may take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatever else may hinder from godly union and concord; and that the Lord of all power and might may bless what there is here of His truth, to the profit of souls, and to the glory of His holy Name, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

PAPERS ON THE

EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE.

No. I.

VIEWS OF OUR REFORMERS:

ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

The particular point of Eucharistic doctrine with which these Papers have immediately to do, is that which of late years has been so prominently set forth under the name of "The Real Objective Presence." At the time of the Reformation the phrase "Real Presence" was commonly regarded as indicating a doctrine *not* held by our Reformers. But while in the sense which it commonly bore they rejected it, there was another sense (as descriptive of the true efficacious Presence, not in the elements, but in the ministration) in which they were not afraid to accept and use it. And subsequently it commended itself to the judgment of some of our eminent divines, whose views were not repugnant to the principles of the Reformation.

And it is quite possible that, in the same way, the expression "Real Objective Presence" may commend itself to the minds of some, who, while willing to adopt a novel phraseology, are far from intending to adopt any novelty in doctrine.

Objection, indeed, may be taken to the form of expression. But it is not the expression, but the doctrine; not the name, but the thing, with which we are concerned. This

doctrine has been taught and is being taught, not as any matter of opinion, but as "*de fide*." It has been taught, and it is being taught, as the doctrine of the English Church.

And the enquiry is one which English churchmen are beginning to feel to be of momentous importance, and one too, to which they should seek an answer,—whether this doctrine was, indeed, held by our Reformers; and whether it is contained in the teaching of our Formularies.

In this enquiry they are asking for guidance and help; and such guidance and help it is the primary aim of these Papers to afford.

It will be convenient, for reasons which will appear as we proceed, to bring under review: *first*, the teaching of our Reformers; *next*, that of books of lower authority in the English Church; *then*, that of (1) our Catechism and Liturgy, and then (2) of our Articles.

In the first place we must endeavour to gain as clear a view as we can of what is meant by "The Real Objective Presence," and what *is* that doctrine, which under this name is taught by its maintainers. We must ask of them an answer to the question—

WHAT IS MEANT BY THE REAL OBJECTIVE PRESENCE?

I. We are told "that in the Holy Eucharist, the Body and Blood of Christ are present, yet not after the manner of a body, but spiritually, sacramentally, divinely, mystically, ineffably, supra-locally, through the operation of the Word of Christ, and of God the Holy Ghost."

II. But with this we are told, that the Body and Blood of Christ are REALLY, TRULY, and SUBSTANTIALLY so present, after consecration, *in, or under the form of bread and wine, that* (unless by special Divine interference this Presence be

withdrawn) *where the elements are, there, of necessity are the body and blood of Christ, and this quite independent and irrespective of use and participation,* so that—

(1.) When the bread is taken into the hand, from the hand of the priest, there in the bodily hand is the Body of Christ; and when the mouth receives the bread and wine, there in the bodily mouth, under the form of bread and wine, is the Body and Blood of Christ.

(2.) Wicked men and unbelievers, receiving the bread and wine, receive, equally with believers, the very Body and Blood of Christ.

(3.) When the elements are on the Holy Table, there is Christ under the form of bread and wine, and Christ being there, is there to be adored, under those forms of bread and wine.

(4.) By virtue of this Presence, the Holy Eucharist is the sacrifice of the New Covenant, quite distinct from any figurative or only commemorative offering, or any offering of (1) prayer and praise, or (2) of ourselves, our souls and bodies, or (3) of our alms and oblations; inasmuch as that same body, once for all sacrificed for us, and that same blood, once for all shed for us, are offered and pleaded before the Father by the priest.

The doctrine of this sacrifice is regarded by some as easily reconcileable with the Sacrifice of the Mass.

It is important to add that by some of the teachers of this doctrine very *special* stress is laid on the Body and Blood of Christ being "given in and by the consecrated bread and wine to *all*," (whether worthy or unworthy) and "received by *all* who come to the Lord's Table." And the importance of this, we are told, is, that "it supplies an unfailing test of what is meant by any one who affirms of himself that he holds the doctrine of the Real Presence."

It is to be carefully observed also that this Presence is to be regarded, according to its teachers, as something quite distinct and different from any Presence of the virtue, efficacy, and saving power of Christ's Body and Blood. It is nothing less than the Body and Blood of Christ themselves, which (according to "the Real Objective Presence") are "PRESENT THINGS" "under the form of Bread and Wine."

Such being the doctrine taught under the name of "the Real Objective Presence," we proceed first—

TO COMPARE THIS DOCTRINE WITH THE TEACHING OF OUR REFORMERS.

We turn to the writings of our Reformers to enquire,

I. Did they teach this doctrine?

Or, II. Did they regard it as an open question?

Or, III. Did they not reject and repudiate it?

At the threshold of this enquiry it may be well to observe that the phrase "Real Presence" was in common use at the time of the Reformation, to signify one chief part of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, that part which the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist (commonly known as Consubstantiation) did not reject, and which, it seems to be generally now understood and admitted, is at one with the doctrine known as "the Real Objective Presence."

And when this doctrine is sometimes spoken of by Romish writers as the "Corporal Presence," or the "Carnal Presence," we are not to suppose that by this they meant "Presence *after a bodily manner*" (any more than those who now teach "the Real Objective Presence") but "Presence *of a Body*," though it be of a Body present after the manner of a spirit.

In conducting our enquiry as to the opinion of our Reformers on this question, we will first take in order the

Archbishops of Canterbury, beginning with the reign of Edward VI., and ending with the reign of Elizabeth.

We shall thus have before us four names: 1. Cranmer. 2. Parker. 3. Grindall. 4. Whitgift.

1. Cranmer.

Cranmer was born in 1489, educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, married a niece of Osiander, 1531, was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury 1533. His influence was predominant in the Reformation of Edward VI. He was imprisoned on the accession of Mary in 1553, then taken to Oxford, and after disputation condemned and excommunicated as a heretic. His courage failed him, and he was prevailed upon to sign a recantation. But, at last, he died in the faith of the Reformation, most solemnly recanting his recantation, and declaring, "I believe concerning the Sacrament as I taught in my book against the late Bishop of Winchester." He was burnt on the 21st March 1855, his left hand pointing upwards, his right hand (which had signed the recantation) thrust into the flames with the cry, "Oh! this unworthy hand!" "With upturned eye the poor penitent exclaimed, 'Lord Jesus receive my spirit.' The body was motionless; not once did it swerve from its position; it seemed to be as insensible of pain as the stake to which it was bound." (Hook's Lives. Series 2, vol. ii., p. 417.)

No doubt there are in the writings of Cranmer (as of others among our Reformers) expressions used sometimes, such as, isolated from the context, and viewed apart from explanatory statements, might seem to be not inconsistent with the doctrine before us. All such passages are cleared from misunderstanding, and have their true sense stamped upon them, by the following very clear and distinct statement in his Preface to "The Answer to Gardiner." (Edition of 1551.)

I.

"When I say and repeat many times in my book, that

the Body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the Sacrament; lest any man should mistake my words, and think that I mean, that although Christ be not corporally in the outward visible signs, yet He is corporally in the persons that duly receive them, this is to advertise the reader, that I mean no such thing; but my meaning is, that the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ's Body that was crucified for us, and of His Blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the Sacraments." (Parker Society Edition, 3.)

A few more extracts from Cranmer's writings shall be set down here.

II.

"They (the Papists) say that Christ is corporally under or in the form of bread and wine. We say that Christ is NOT THERE, neither *corporally* nor *spiritually;* but in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine, He is spiritually, and corporally in heaven." (P.S. Edit. i. p. 54.)

III.

"This spiritual meat of Christ's Body and Blood is *not received in the mouth* and digested in the stomach (as corporal meats and drinks commonly be,) but it is received with a pure heart and a sincere *faith*. And the *true eating and drinking* of the said Body and Blood of Christ is, with a constant and lively *faith to believe*, that Christ gave His body, and shed His blood upon the Cross for us, and that

He doth so join and incorporate Himself to us, that He is our head and we His members, and flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bones, having Him dwelling in us, and we in Him." (Ibid, 43.)

IV.

"I mean not that Christ is *spiritually* either *in the table*, or *in the bread and wine* that be upon the table; but I mean that He is present in the ministration and receiving of that holy Supper, according to His own institution and ordinance." (Ibid, 148.)

V.

"I am *sure* that evil men DO NOT eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ." (Ibid, 426.)

VI.

"Christ spake absolutely of manna and of the Supper; so that, after that absolute speaking of the Supper, wicked men *can* IN NO WISE *eat of the flesh of Christ and drink His blood*." * (Ibid, 427.)

VII.

"This therefore shall be my issue: that as no Scripture, so no ancient author, known and approved, hath in plain terms your transubstantiation: nor that the Body and Blood of Christ be *really, corporally, naturally, and carnally under the forms of bread and wine;* NOR THAT EVIL MEN DO EAT THE VERY BODY AND DRINK THE VERY BLOOD OF CHRIST; nor *that Christ is offered every* day by the priest a sacrifice propitiatory for sin." (Ibid, 13.)

* The italics and capitals in these quotations *generally* are mine.

VIII.

In Cranmer's disputations at Oxford, we have Weston concluding an argument thus:—"*Ergo*, His true, natural, organical flesh is given to us to be eaten." Then follows—

Cranmer:—"I grant the consequence and the consequent."

Weston:—"Therefore we eat it with our mouth."

Cranmer:—"I DENY IT. We eat it through faith." (Ibid, 403.)

IX.

Again, *Weston:*—"When Christ said, 'Eat ye,' whether meant He, by the mouth or by faith?"

Cranmer:—"He meant that we should receive the body by faith, the bread by the mouth."

Weston:—"Nay, the body by the mouth."

Cranmer:—"THAT I DENY." (Ibid, 404).

X.

The following passage is given to show that Cranmer was contending against no gross, carnal, popular conception of the "Real Presence," as distinguished from the more recondite teaching of theologians.

"But why should I join with you here an issue in that matter which I never spake? For I never read, nor heard no man that said, saving you alone, that we do eat Christ grossly, or carnally, or as eating is taken in common speech without any figure; but all that ever I have heard or read say quite clean, contrary."* (Ibid, 112.)

* This passage is quoted by Dr. Blakeney in a paper in "The Protestant Churchman," (July, 1869, p. 319). Dr. Blakeney adds, "Cranmer is astonished that Gardiner would acknowledge a carnal

It would be easy to multiply quotations from Cranmer; but the above are perhaps more than sufficient to show clearly what Cranmer's views were. The place which

Presence even in a sense, and says that in doing so he stood alone. What a refutation is this of the assumption of Dr. Newman, of Dr. Pusey, Mr. Perry, and others, that it was only against a gross and carnal Presence the Reformers contended!" It is, indeed, obvious to every one reading the writings and disputations of the Reformers, that they had to deal with, not any gross popular statements of doctrines, but just the same subtilties as we have to meet now. But our Reformers held that the Corporal Presence, being the presence of a body, must, of necessity, be a gross and carnal Presence.

And herein Mr. Cobb, in the sequel to the "Kiss of Peace," (Preface vii., and Sec. ii. *passim*,) when he complains that Cranmer "never understood what was the Roman doctrine on this question," is himself, if I mistake not, altogether misunderstanding Cranmer. Cranmer must have been very blind indeed, if he did not see where Gardiner would have led him. Cranmer *saw clearly enough*, but he altogether *refused to follow*. He denied that it was possible to follow without *absurdities*. I think Mr. Cobb will find that Cranmer did "*consciously reject*" what Mr. Cobb calls "the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence." (See Sequel, p. 211.) For not only did his mind *never grasp* the idea that there could be such a Presence real, yet not "corporal;" but his mind actually denied it. Nay, I believe Mr. Cobb will find that not Cranmer only, but our Reformers, and not our Reformers only, but subsequent Divines, maintained that the Presence of a Body, not as a Body, involves a contradiction. "Truth in what kind soever, is by no kind of truth gainsayed." (Hooker, Vol. ii., p. 360, Edit. Keble.) And, therefore, they held that the *truth* of Christ's Body, being corporally and locally present in heaven, forbids its being present, even though it be the Body of Christ, in another manner, that is to say, spiritually and *supralocally* on ten thousand altars at once. (See especially Cranmer on Lord's Supper, P. S. Edit., pp. 97, 98, 102, 140, 186.) And I must venture to submit that it was no peculiarity in the minds of Cranmer and our Reformers, that they *could not grasp* the idea of the Corporal Presence of a Body which has flesh and bones, being present *with flesh and bones;* yet present not corporally, but spiritually as to the mode, *i.e.*

Cranmer occupies in the history of the English Reformation will justify our taking *so many*. To give more is the less needful now, because Dr. Pusey has acknowledged that

present after *the manner of a spirit*, which "*hath not flesh and bones.*"

The Corporal Presence of a Body corporally present with flesh and bones, THIS IS *a gross Carnal Presence*. And its grossness and carnality is *not* to be evaded or escaped by attempting to explain that the word "corporally" does not tell of the *manner* of the Presence, which is spiritual. If the explanation is *good*, the teaching which it explains is *gone*. If the teaching is *good*, the explanation is *worthless*. Is it wonderful that such evasions found "*no response*" in Cranmer's mind? (Page 187.)

Suppose I maintain the Presence of an angle as an *obtuse* angle; but finding an *obtuse* angle inadmissible, I attempt by explanation to make it appear that though a very obtuse angle, it is only very *acutely* present, or present after the manner of a very *acute* angle.

Will any one grasp my idea? Will not every one accuse me of absurdities? Shall I not be told that what is "acute" in the explanation of the *manner*, can never take away from what is "obtuse" in the statement concerning the angle?

And will the case be very different if I venture to say that in the matter before us, that which is "spiritual" in the explanation of the mode, can never take away from that which is "corporal" in the statement concerning the Presence? How difficult it is to reconcile the statement of the "corporal," and the explanation of the "spiritual" in the minds of the uneducated is evident, I suppose, from what we are told of "the gross popular view" which our Reformers had to combat." (See "Cranmer on Lord's Supper," p. 327.) How difficult also in the case of minds, some of which, at least, we should have expected to be better instructed, is evident from the words which Mr. Cobb quotes of King Henry the Fourth:

"The clergy," he said, "should engage in the search for the philospher's stone; for since they can change bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, they must also, by the help of God, succeed in transmuting the baser metals into gold," (Sequel, p. 169);

Cranmer went "over to the Swiss school," and "unhappily fell" into the "Zwinglian heresy;" and the author of "The Kiss of Peace" has been constrained in his new edition alto-

and still more from the well-known recantation put into the mouth of Berengarius by Pope Nicolas, viz.:—

"That the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ sensually, not only in sacrament, but in truth, is handled by the priest's hands; and broken and grinded by the teeth of the faithful," words which though now renounced by the Church of Rome, were publicly read at Rome before one hundred and fourteen bishops, and sent by the Pope up and down the Churches of Italy, France, and Germany. (See "Jeremy Taylor," vol. vi., p. 203, &c.)

But the question is, Are the two really reconcileable in truth? No doubt it will be said, "Certainly they are, to faith which believes miracles.—(See "Tracts for the Day," v., pp. 31, 32.)

But to this let it be answered, "A miracle is one thing: a contradiction is another." And one not versed in the subtilties of the schools may, I trust, be forgiven in expressing a strong opinion, that, as it is a very unwise proceeding to aim at anything like training faith to believe all sorts of miracles without warrant of Scripture, or any other sufficient evidence; so it is a most dangerous thing to set faith to exercise itself in doing anything like putting out the eyes of common sense.

Hooker says of Christ's glorious Body: "A Body still it continueth, a Body consubstantial with our bodies, a Body of the same both nature and measure which it had on earth." (Eccles. Pol. v, 55.)

Jeremy Taylor writes: "God can new create the body, and change it into a spirit; but can a body, remaining a body, be at the same time a spirit? Or can it be a body, and yet not be in a place? Is it not determined so, that remaining in a place, it cannot be out of it? . . . . Now although God can change anything from being the thing it is to become another thing, yet is it not a contradiction to say it should be the same it is, and yet not the same? These are the essential, immediate consequents of supposing a body remaining a body, whose essence it is to be finite and determined in one place, can yet so remaining, be in a thousand places." (Real Presence, sect. xi., p. 14; vol. vi., p. 107.)

gether to give him up. One only quotation shall now be added to show that Cranmer not only had himself views clearly and distinctly opposed to the doctrine in question, but also was so far from looking upon the matter as a question to be left open, that he regarded the doctrine as one to be utterly repudiated by the Reformed Church.

XI.

"The rest is but branches and leaves, the cutting away whereof is but like topping and lopping of a tree, or cutting down of weeds, leaving the body standing and the roots in the ground; but the very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is the Popish doctrine of *transubstantiation*, of the REAL PRESENCE of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Altar, (as they call it,) and of the *sacrifice* and *oblation* of Christ made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and the dead. WHICH ROOTS, IF THEY BE SUFFERED TO GROW IN THE LORD'S VINEYARD, THEY WILL OVERSPREAD ALL THE GROUND AGAIN WITH THE OLD ERRORS AND SUPERSTITIONS. These injuries to Christ be *so intolerable*, that no Christian heart can willingly bear them. Wherefore, seeing that many have set to their hand, and whetted their tools, to pluck up the weeds and to cut down the tree of error, I, not knowing otherwise how to excuse myself at the last day, have in this book set to my hand, and are with the rest, to cut down this tree, and to pluck up the weeds and plants by the roots, which our Heavenly Father never planted, but were grafted and sown in His vineyard by His adversary the devil, and Antichrist his minister." (Preface to Edit. 1550, P.S. 6.)

2. Parker.

Matthew Parker was born A.D. 1504; entered at Cambridge 1520. In 1534 he was made Chaplain to Queen Anne Boleyn, by whom, six days before her apprehension, he was charged with the care of her daughter Elizabeth. (Correspondence, P.S. Edit., pp. 59, 391, 400.) Hence, no doubt, his appointment on Elizabeth's accession, to the Archbishoprick of Canterbury, which very unwillingly (Ibid, p. 57) he was constrained to accept. Hence also his influence with Elizabeth, which he used for the removal, at the commencement of her reign, of the Crucifix and Lights from her chapel, (Ibid, pp. 97, 379; Zur. Letters, i., pp. 122, 129.) In conjunction with others, he also successfully remonstrated against Images. (Ibid, pp. 79—96.) The "Bishops' Bible" was prepared under his direction. In his archbishoprick the Reformed Prayer-book was revised, and the 39 Articles reduced to their present form. He was confessed a learned man, but his strictness in enforcing Conformity gave him an evil name with the Puritans. He died 1575.

Archbishop Parker has left us no publication bearing directly on the subject of these Papers. His doctrinal views will come under consideration in a future paper. For the present it may suffice to observe, (1,) That we owe to Parker the 29th of our present Articles, the title of which is "Of the wicked which do not eat the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper;" and, (2,) that the book of Whitgift, from which the extracts below are taken, was written by Parker's appointment, and was submitted to him for approval and correction, so that on important doctrinal matters, at least, they must be regarded as substantially expressing the opinions of Archbishop Parker.

3. Grindal.

Edmund Grindal was born 1519; educated at Cambridge, where he greatly distinguished himself. In 1550 Bishop Ridley appointed him one of his chaplains, together with Bradford and Rogers. In 1551 he was appointed chaplain to King Edward. On the death of

Edward he took refuge on the Continent. Returning to England on the accession of Elizabeth, he was made Bishop of London in 1559 and in 1570 Archbishop of York, whence, on the death of Parker, in 1575, he was removed to Canterbury. He died in 1583.

The following are quotations from Grindal's writings:—

I.

"I will return to my former question, and prove more at large that Christ's body CANNOT BE EATEN OF THE WICKED. . . . . Moreover, Christ's body must be received WITH FAITH, and NOT WITH THE MOUTH, ... but wicked and impenitent persons lack faith, wherefore they CANNOT EAT THE BODY OF CHRIST." (Works, P.S., Edit. 58.)

II.

"Thus, by the Word of God, by reason, and by the old fathers, it is plain that sinful men EAT NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST, receive they the Sacrament never so oft." (Ibid, 59.)

III.

"Christ's body is food, not for the body, but for the soul; and therefore it must *be received with the instrument of the soul, which is faith.* For as ye receive sustenance for your body by your bodily mouth, so the food of your soul must be received by faith, which is the mouth of the soul." (Ibid, 44.)

IV.

"And whereas you say that the Spirit hath no mouth, like as it hath no body or bones, you are deceived; for the *Spirit hath a mouth in its kind.* . . . . Whereof I will

reason thus: Of whatsoever sort the mouth is, such is his food. But the mouth of the Spirit is spiritual, not bodily. Therefore it receiveth Christ's body spiritually, not bodily. And in like manner Christ, speaking of the eating of His body, nameth Himself the bread, not for the body, but of life, for the soul; and saith, 'He that cometh to me shall not hunger: and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.' Wherefore whoso will be relieved by the body of Christ, must receive Him as He will be received, with the instrument of faith appointed thereunto, not with his teeth or mouth. And whereas I say that Christ's body must be received and taken with faith, I mean not that you should pluck down Christ from heaven and put Him in your faith, as in a visible place, but that you must with your faith rise and spring up to Him, and, leaving this world, dwell above in heaven, putting all your trust, comfort, and consolation in Him, which suffered grievous bondage to set you at liberty and to make you free; creeping into His wounds, which were so cruelly pierced and dented for your sake. *So shall you feed on the body of Christ;* so shall you suck the blood that was poured out and shed for you. This is the spiritual, THE VERY TRUE, the ONLY EATING of Christ's body. . . . . It is plain that Christ's body is meat for our spirit, and hath NOTHING TO DO WITH OUR BODY." (Ibid, 45, 46.)

v.

"Mark well what ye have said, for you have granted me great repugnance. First, you say, that no body, being not

spiritual, can be in sundry places at once. Then say you, that at the Maundy Christ's body was not spiritual; and yet hold you, that He was there present, visible before the apostle's eyes, and in each of their hands and mouths all at one time, which grants of yours are not agreeable." (Ibid, p. 51.)

VI.

"Christ in a sacrament gave His own body to be eaten in faith. The priest, for lack of faith, receiveth accidents and dimensions. Christ gave a *sacrament* to strengthen men's faith; the priest giveth a *sacrifice* to redeem men's souls. Christ gave it to be eaten, the priest giveth it to be worshipped. And to conclude, Christ gave bread: the priest saith he giveth a God." (Ibid, p. 57.)

VII.

"I owe then this to you as an individual, that by the perusal of your treatise on the 'Origin of Error,' about twenty years since, I was first led to entertain a correct opinion respecting the Lord's Supper; whereas before that time I had adopted the sentiments of Luther on that subject. It is but just, therefore, that I should respect him from whom I have received so much benefit." (Letter to H. Bullinger, Feb. 8th, 1567. Zurich Letters, i. 182.)

These extracts are conclusive as to Grindal's own views. We have also sufficient testimony as to the fact of his regarding this matter as no open question in the Church of

England. Writing to Bullinger, August 27th, 1566, he says, "We most fully agree with your Churches, and with the confession you have lately set forth." (Zurich Letters, i. 169.

Still more important is a letter written by him in conjunction with Bishop Horne, in answer to a false report which had been spread abroad on the Continent, that in the English Church the bread was not broken in common, but put into the mouth, and that the mode of spiritual manducation and of the presence of Christ's body in the sacred Supper was not to be explained, but to be left open.

The false report is contained in a letter from Bullinger and Gualter, in which it was said—

"Nunc vero audimus (utinam rumore falso) requiri . . . . Neque vero modum spiritualis manducationis, et presentiæ Coporis Christi in Sacra Cæna explicandum, sed relinquendum in medio."

In answer to this letter the reply of Bishops Grindal and Horne states—

"Almost all these articles are falsely imputed to us. . . . . The Church of England, too, has entirely given up the use of [prayers in] a foreign tongue, breathings, exorcisms, oil, spittle, clay, *lighted tapers*, and other things of that kind, which, by the Act of Parliament are never to be restored. We entirely agree that women neither can nor ought to baptise infants, upon any account whatever. In the receiving of the Lord's Supper, the laws require, custom sanctions, and our Anglo-Louvaine calumniators in their reckless writings bear us witness, that we break the bread

in common to every communicant, not putting it into his mouth, but placing it in his hand. *They testify also to* OUR EXPLANATION *of the* MANNER OF THE SPIRITUAL FEEDING AND PRESENCE *of the body of Christ* in the holy Supper." (Zurich Letters, i. pp. 178, 179.)

WHITGIFT.

JOHN WHITGIFT was born about 1530, educated at Cambridge, at Pembroke Hall, where Ridley was Master, and Grindal and Bradford were fellows. Bradford was his tutor. He did not leave England, but escaped persecution during the reign of Queen Mary. In 1567, he was made chaplain to Queen Elizabeth. As Master of Trinity College, he was brought into antagonism with Thomas Cartwright, (T. C.,) the Puritan. Subsequently he wrote an answer to the "Admonition to the Parliament." Cartwright replied. And Whitgift in 1574, published the Defence of his Answer. In 1577 he was consecrated Bishop of Winchester. He refused to be removed to Canterbury during the lifetime of Grindal, who had incurred the Queen's displeasure; but accepted the archbishopriek on Grindal's death in 1583. He attended Queen Elizabeth on her death-bed, and crowned King James in 1603, was present at the Hampton Court Conference, and died in 1604.

I.

He wrote in answer to T. C. (*i.e.* Thomas Cartwright) :—

"I never heard that any learned man as yet misliked this place of Augustine; but I know they have used it as a most manifest testimony against Transubstantiation and *the Real Presence*, and as a *true declaration* wherefore the sacramental bread and wine be called the Body and Blood of Christ, being but the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ." (Works, P. S. Edit. iii., p. 113.)

II.

"T. C.: *You would think you had wrong, if because some of those that favour that which you favour in this matter be either freewill men, or hold Consubstantiation in the Sacrament, you should be challenged as freewill men, or maintainers of Consubstantiation.*"

Jo. WHITGIFT (In answer)

"If there were either so many 'freewill men, or maintainers of the Consubstantiation,' as there be of the sect of the Puritans; or *if they were maintained and justified* by us, as the other be by you, then, surely you might justly charge us with their errors; else the reason is not like." (Works, vol. i., pp. 94-5-6.)

III.

T. C.: "*But the ease standeth in this, that, forasmuch as the common and usual speech of England is, to note by the word 'priest' not a minister of the Gospel, but a sacrificer, which the minister of the Gospel* IS NOT; *therefore we ought not to call the ministers of the Gospel 'priests.'*"

Jo. WHITGIFT (In answer)

"I am not greatly delighted with the name, nor so desirous to maintain it; but yet a truth is to be defended. I read in the old fathers that these two names, *sacerdos* and *presbyter* be confounded. I see also that the learned and the best of English writers, such I mean as write in these our days, translate this word *presbyter* so; and the very word itself, as it is used in our English tongue,

soundeth the word *presbyter*. As heretofore use hath made it to be taken for *a sacrificer*, so will use now alter that signification, and make it to be taken for *a minister of the Gospel*. But it is mere vanity to contend for the name when WE AGREE OF THE THING: the name may be used, and not used without any great offence." (Works, vol. iii., p. 351.)

IV.

But we have most important testimony, not only of Whitgift's repudiating the doctrine of the Real Presence for himself but of the Church of England having *refused* it.

T. C. had said:—

"*Peter Martyr, upon the x chapter of the second book of the Kings saith, that the Lutherans must take heed lest, whilst they cut off many popish errors, they follow Jehu by retaining also many popish things. For they defend still the Real Presence in the Bread of the Supper, and images, and vestments, etc.; and saith that 'religion must be wholly reformed to the quick.'*"

In reply Whitgift says:—

"Mr. Martyr nameth the popish things which the Lutherans observe to be the REAL PRESENCE, *images*, *all the popish apparel which they used in their Mass*, (for so doth he mean); which THIS CHURCH HAS REFUSED. What his opinion is of *this* apparel that *we retain* I have declared, Tract vii., chap. v., the 4th division; where he of purpose

speaketh concerning the same. *God be thanked,* RELIGION IS WHOLLY REFORMED, *even to the quick,* IN THIS CHURCH." (Ibid, 550).

These extracts from the writings of men holding (either at the time of writing or subsequently) the position of highest authority in the English Church, are here brought forward as expressing the views of individual Reformers. But it may be worth while to observe in passing (what indeed can scarcely escape observation) that they possess a certain historical value besides. In the case of Cranmer none will dispute that we have statements of a certain doctrine, and of a certain repudiation of doctrine, quite sufficient to show us what would be the aim of one to whom it was given, in the Providence of God, more than to any other, to mould our Formularies and frame our Articles. And in the case of Grindal and Whitgift we have declarations of doctrine and repudiation of doctrine, not for themselves alone, but on the part of the English Church. Their statements are statements of what was and what was not the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England. Their words cannot be understood as declaring anything less than that the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence was excluded from the teaching of the English Church.

Add to this Parker's sanction of Whitgift's Book. And if anything is needful to make it plain that such sanction extended to such statements concerning the doctrine of our Church, add the words of Parker himself: "We be in ONE UNIFORM DOCTRINE of the same." (Letter to Cecil in Cor-

respondence, p. 379.) And then I think it will appear that the question, whether or not this doctrine is the doctrine of the English Church, is *reduced to the question of the* TRUTH OR FALSEHOOD OF THREE SUCCESSIVE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY. I do not see how we can fail to acknowledge this, unless indeed we are prepared to maintain that Parker, Grindal, and Whitgift, were men altogether ignorant in this matter, and entirely mistaken as to what is and what is not the doctrine of the Church of England.

Nay, more than this, such statements derive additional weight from the fact of their being not only spoken out with unquestioning, perfect, and, indeed, we may say, with surprising confidence, but also being allowed and accepted by Puritan adversaries, who would never have hesitated to deny them, if denial had been counted possible, or to question them, if, in their judgment, the matter had admitted of question.

Nay, we may go further still, and say, that in the case of Whitgift at least, so far as his testimony was public, and not public only, but prominent—and prominent as the statement of one who was put forward (in a manner) to be the public champion of the Church of England—so far too, as afterwards it acquired additional prominence by his exaltation to the archiepiscopal throne; so far his distinct statement, not being called in question by Puritan opponents, not being disputed by other English theologians, not being disallowed by succeeding Convocations, not being protested against by subsequent Parliaments, but silently accepted and acknowledged by the whole body of the English Church, must, I think, be regarded as carrying a weight, such as weighed in the balances of unprejudiced truth cannot easily be overborne.

And this testimony, let it be observed, is testimony to

the doctrine of our Church at a period, and in a reign, which subsequent changes and subsequent legislation seem to recognize as containing the true date of the substantial settlement of our doctrinal Formularies.

The next Paper will be occupied with the writings of Reformers in the reign of Edward VI.

PAPERS ON THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE.

No. II.

VIEWS OF OUR REFORMERS:

REFORMERS OF THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI.

In this Paper will be found extracts from those Reformers alone who did not survive the reign of Queen Mary. Others, however, eminent in King Edward's reign, will find their place in the Paper following.

In some cases the extracts may be thought to be unnecessarily long. But there are some which seemed too valuable to be omitted, though the evidence, as to the writer's views, might be sufficient without them. All, however, will be found, it is believed, to have an important bearing, more or less distinct, on the question before us.

Ridley.

Nicholas Ridley was born 1500, and educated at Cambridge. During an absence of three years from England he made acquaintance with several of the Early Reformers. He became chaplain to Cranmer in 1537. He was made bishop of Rochester in 1547, and removed in 1550 to London, where he exerted his influence for the removal of altars. He was committed to the Tower in July 1553, and burnt at Oxford Oct. 16, 1555. The charge against him was that he had affirmed, and openly defended and maintained (1) that the true and natural body of Christ, after the consecration of the priest, is not really present in the sacrament of the altar. (2) That

in the sacrament of the altar remaineth still the substance of bread and wine. (3) That in the Mass is no propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead. (See Works, P. S. edit., p. 271.)

Ridley's views have a claim on our careful attention peculiarly their own. For Ridley may be called the master-mind of the English Reformation in the reign of Edward VI. The Romanists said "Latimer leaneth to Cranmer, Cranmer to Ridley, and Ridley to the singularity of his own wit." And though Ridley modestly would have himself regarded as far inferior to Cranmer; yet Cranmer himself declared that he owed his altered views of the Lord's Supper to conferences with Ridley.

But besides this, the attempts which have been made to represent Ridley as teaching the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence," make it specially important that we should not mistake what Ridley's teaching really was. Hence our quotations from him will be somewhat copious.

1.

"I acknowledge gladly the true body of Christ to be in the Lord's Supper, in such sort as the Church of Christ (which is the spouse of Christ, and is taught of the Holy Ghost, and guided by God's word) doth acknowledge the same. But the true Church of Christ doth acknowledge a presence of Christ's body in the Lord's Supper to be communicated *to the godly by grace*, and *spiritually*, as I have often shewed, and by a *sacramental signification;* but *not by the corporal presence of the body of His flesh.*" (Works, P. S. Edit., p. 236.)

II.

"True it is, every sacrament hath grace annexed unto it instrumentally. But there is divers understanding of that word '*habet*,' '*hath*:' for the sacrament *hath not grace included in it;* but *to those that receive it well,* it is turned to grace. After that manner the water in baptism hath grace promised, and by that grace the Holy Spirit is given: not that grace is included in water, but that grace cometh by water." (Ibid, p. 240.)

III.

"I grant also that there is no promise made to bread and wine. But inasmuch as they are sanctified, and made *the Sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord,* they have a promise of grace annexed unto them; namely, of spiritual partaking of the body of Christ to be communicated and given, *not to the bread and wine,* but *to them which worthily do receive* the sacrament." (Ibid, p. 240.)

This sacrament hath a promise of grace, made to *those that receive it worthily,* because grace is given by it, as by an instrument; *not that Christ hath transfused grace into the bread and wine.*" (Ibid, p. 241.)

IV.

"I, being fully by God's word thereunto persuaded, confess Christ's natural body to be in the sacrament indeed by spirit and grace, because that whosoever receiveth worthily that bread and wine, receiveth effectuously Christ's

body, and drinketh His blood (THAT IS, HE IS MADE EFFECTUALLY PARTAKER OF HIS PASSION); and you make a grosser kind of being, enclosing a natural, a lively, and a moving body, *under the shape or form of bread and wine.* Now, this difference considered, to the question thus I answer, that in the sacrament of the altar is the natural body and blood of Christ *vere et realiter,* indeed and really, for *spiritually, by grace and efficacy;* for so *every worthy receiver receiveth the very true body of Christ.* But if you mean *really and indeed,* so that thereby you would include a lively and a moveable *body under the forms of bread and wine,* then, in that sense, is NOT CHRIST'S BODY IN THE SACRAMENT *really and indeed.*" (Ibid, p. 274.)

V.

"This doctrine maintaineth a real, corporal, and carnal presence of Christ's flesh, assumed and taken of the Word, to be in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that not *by virtue and grace* only, but also by the *whole essence and substance of the body and flesh of Christ.*

But SUCH A PRESENCE DISAGREETH FROM GOD'S WORD *from the rule of faith,* and cannot but draw with it many absurdities." (Ibid, p. 197.)

VI.

"It destroyeth and taketh away the institution of the Lord's Supper, which was commanded only to be used and continued UNTIL THE LORD HIMSELF SHOULD COME. If,

therefore, *He be now really present in the body of His flesh,* then must *the Supper cease:* for a remembrance is not of a thing present, but of a thing *past and absent.* And there is a difference between remembrance and presence, and, as one of the fathers saith, 'A figure is in vain where the thing figured is present.'" (Ibid, p. 199.)

VII.

"The circumstances of the Scripture, the analogy and proportion of the Sacraments, and the testimony of the faithful fathers, ought to rule us in taking the meaning of the holy Scripture touching the sacrament.

"But the words of the Lord's Supper, the circumstances of the Scripture, the analogy of the sacraments, and the sayings of the Fathers, do most effectually and plainly prove a *figurative speech* in the words of the Lord's Supper; *Ergo,* A FIGURATIVE SENSE AND MEANING *is specially to be received* in these words, "This is my body." (Ibid, p. 205.)

VIII.

Ward:—"He gave to us His flesh to be eaten, the which He took of the earth, in which also here He walked, etc. But He never gave His flesh to be eaten, but when He gave it at His Supper, saying, 'This is My Body.'"

"*Ergo,* in the Eucharist He gave us His flesh."

Ridley:—"You do allege the place of Augustine upon Psalm xcviii., where he saith, that Christ gave His flesh to be eaten which He took of the earth, and in which here

He walked; inferring hereupon that Christ *never gave the same His flesh to be eaten, but only in the Eucharist:* I DENY your minor; for He gave it both in the Eucharist to be eaten, and *also otherwise,* AS WELL IN THE WORD, *as also upon the cross.*" (Ibid, p. 234.)

IX.

"And I also *worship Christ* in the sacrament; but *not because He is included* in the sacrament: like as I *worship Christ also in the Scriptures,* not because He is really included in them. Notwithstanding I say, that the body of Christ is present in the sacrament; but yet *sacramentally* and *spiritually* (according to His grace) giving life, and *in that respect* REALLY, that is, according to His benediction, giving life." (Ibid, pp. 235, 236.)

X.

"Again I say, like as the bread of the sacrament and of thanksgiving is called the body of Christ given for us; so the cup of the Lord is called the blood which sprang from the side of Christ: but that sacramental bread *is called the body,* because it is *the sacrament of His body.* Even so likewise the cup *is called the blood* also, which flowed out of Christ's side, because it is *the Sacrament of that blood* which flowed out of His side, instituted of the Lord Himself for our singular commodity, namely for our spiritual nourishment; like as baptism is ordained in water to our spiritual regeneration."

Curtop :—"The sacrament of the blood is not the blood."

Ridley :—"The *sacrament* of the blood is *the blood;* and that is *attributed to the sacrament,* which is spoken of *the thing of the sacrament.*"

Weston :—"That which is in the chalice, is the same which flowed out of Christ's side. But there came out very blood."

"*Ergo,* There is very blood in the chalice."

Ridley :—"The blood of Christ is in the chalice indeed, but NOT *in* THE REAL PRESENCE, but by grace, and *in a sacrament.*"

Weston :—"That is very well. Then we have blood in the chalice."

Ridley :—"It is true; but by *grace,* and in a *sacrament.*" (Ibid, pp. 237, 238.)

XI.

Watson :—". . . . The fathers say, that evil men do eat Him which descended from heaven."

Ridley :—"They eat Him indeed, but *sacramentally.* The Fathers use many times the *sacrament* for the *matter of the sacrament,* and all that same place maketh against you: and so here he cited the place. . . . ."

Weston :—"Chrysostom saith, that the same punishment remaineth to them which receive the body of the Lord unworthily, as to them which crucified Him."

Ridley :—"That is, because they defile the Lord's body: for evil men do eat the body of Christ *sacramentally,* but

good men eat both the *sacrament* and the *matter of the sacrament.*" (Ibid, pp. 247, 248.)

XII.

Ridley :—"Moreover, there is ambiguity in this word, 'really,' whether it be to be taken as the logicians term it, 'transcendenter;' that is, most generally; and so it may signify *any manner of thing which belongeth to the body of Christ, by any means : after which sort* we also grant Christ's body to be *really* in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper (as in disputation, if occasion be given, shall be declared), or whether it be taken to signify the *very same thing, having body, life, and soul,* which was assumed and taken of the Word of God into the unity of person. *In which sense,* SINCE THE BODY OF CHRIST IS REALLY IN HEAVEN, *because of the true manner of His body,* it *may* NOT be said to be here in the earth." (Ibid, p. 196.)

XIII.

Ridley :—"We do handle the signs *reverently :* but we *worship* the sacrament *as a sacrament,* not as a thing signified by the sacrament."

Glyn :—"What is the symbol or *sacrament ?*"

Ridley :—"*Bread.*"

Glyn :—"Ergo, We worship bread."

Ridley :—"There is a deceit in this word 'Adoramus.' We *worship* the symbols, when *reverently we handle them.* We worship Christ wheresoever we perceive His benefits;

but we understand His benefits to be greatest in the sacrament."

Glyn :—"So I may fall down before the bench here, and worship Christ; and if any man ask me what I do, I may answer, I worship Christ."

Ridley :—"We adore and worship Christ in the Eucharist. And if you mean the *external sacrament;* I say, that also is to be worshipped *as a sacrament.*" (Ibid, p. 236.)

XIV.

Ridley:—"Of Christ's REAL PRESENCE there may be a *double understanding.* If you take the REAL PRESENCE of Christ according to *the real and corporal substance which He took of the Virgin,* THAT PRESENCE *being in heaven* CANNOT BE ON THE EARTH ALSO. But if you mean a REAL PRESENCE, 'secundum rem aliquam quæ ad corpus Christi pertinet,' *i. e.,* according to *something that appertaineth to Christ's body, certes* the ascension and abiding in heaven are no let at all to *that presence.* Wherefore Christ's Body, *after that sort,* is here present to us in the Lord's Supper; by grace I say, as Epiphanius speaketh it." . . . .

Ridley:—"Master doctor, this argument is nothing worth. I do not so straitly tie Christ up in heaven, that He may not come into the earth at His pleasure: for when He will, He may come down from heaven, and be on the earth, as it liketh Himself. Howbeit I DO AFFIRM, that it is NOT POSSIBLE *for Him to be* BOTH IN HEAVEN AND EARTH at one time." (Ibid, p. 213.)

XV.

"If (I say) the true solution of that former question, whereupon all these controversies do hang, be, that the natural substance of bread is the material substance in the sacrament of Christ's blessed body. . . . Then also the natural substance of Christ's human nature, which He took of the Virgin Mary, *is in heaven*, where it reigneth now in glory, and *not here* inclosed *under the form of bread*. Then that *godly honour*, which is only due unto God the Creator, *may* not be done unto the creature without idolatry and sacrilege, IS NOT TO BE DONE UNTO THE HOLY SACRAMENT. Then also the *wicked*, I mean the impenitent, murderer, adulterer, or such-like, DO NOT RECEIVE THE NATURAL SUBSTANCE OF THE BLESSED BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST." (Ibid, p. 12.)

XVI.

"By grace (I say,) that is, by the gift of this life, (mentioned in John;) and the *properties of the same* meet for our pilgrimage here upon earth, *the same body of Christ is here present with us*. Even as, for example, we say the same sun, which, in substance, never removeth his place out of the heavens, is yet present here by his beams, light, and natural influence, where it shineth upon the earth. For God's Word and His Sacraments be, as it were, the beams of Christ, which is *Sol justitiæ*, the Sun of Righteousness." (Ibid, p. 13.)

XVII.

"I know that all these places of the Scripture are avoided by two manner of subtle shifts: the one is, by the dis-

tinction of the bloody and unbloody sacrifice, as though our unbloody sacrifice of the Church were any other than the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, than a commemoration, a shewing forth and a sacramental representation of that one only bloody sacrifice, offered up once for all." . . . . "The meaning of the Fathers was . . . . that the WHOLE *substance of our* SACRIFICE which is frequented of the Church in the Lord's Supper, consisteth in prayers, praise, and giving of thanks, and in remembering and shewing forth of that sacrifice once offered upon the altar of the Cross; that the same might continually be had in reverence by mystery, which once only, and no more, was offered for the price of our redemption." (Ibid, pp. 210, 211.)

XVIII.

"The form of a table shall more move the simple from the superstitious opinions of the popish Mass, unto the right use of the Lord's Supper. For the use of an altar is to *make sacrifice* upon it; the use of a table is to serve for men to eat upon. Now, when we come unto the Lord's board, what do we come for?—*to sacrifice Christ again*, and to crucify Him again, or to feed upon Him that was once only crucified and offered up for us? If we come to feed upon Him, spiritually to eat His body, and spiritually to drink His blood (which is *the true use* of the Lord's Supper), then no man can deny but *the form of a table is more meet for the Lord's board, than the form of an altar.*" (Ibid, p. 322.)

XIX.

"The form of an altar was ordained for the sacrifices of the law, and therefore the altar in Greek is called θυσιαστήριον *quasi sacrificii locus.* But now both the law and *the sacrifices* thereof *do cease:* wherefore the *form of the altar* used in the altar *ought to cease* withal." (Ibid, p. 323.)

XX.

Ridley:—"As for the taking down of the altars, it was done upon just considerations, for that they seemed to come too nigh to the Jews' usage: neither was the Supper of the Lord at any time better ministered, [or] more duly received, than in those latter days when all things were brought to the rites and usage of the primitive Church."

Lincoln:—"A goodly receiving, I promise you, to set an oyster-table instead of an altar, and to come from puddings at Westminster, to receive: and, yet when your table was constituted, you could never be content, in placing the same now east, now north, now one way, now another, until it pleased God of His goodness to place it clean out of the church."

Ridley:—"Your lordship's unreverend terms do not elevate the thing. Perhaps some men come more devoutly from puddings, than other men now do from other things." (Ibid, p. 281.)

LATIMER.

Hugh Latimer was born in 1470. In 1535 he was appointed Bishop of Worcester. He resigned his bishopric and retired into the

country on the passing of the Six Articles. He was very popular in the reign of Edward VI. On Mary's accession he was tried with Ridley for heresy. The articles against him were these: "That thou hast openly affirmed, defended, and maintained, that the true and natural body of Christ, after the consecration of the priest, is not really present in the sacrament of the altar, and that in the sacrament of the Altar remaineth still the substance of bread and wine." Latimer replied, "After a corporal being, which the Romish Church furnisheth, Christ's body and blood is not in the sacrament under the forms of bread and wine." He was burnt at Oxford, October 16th, 1555, with Ridley, to whom he said, "Be of good comfort, Master Ridley, and play the man; we shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as, I trust, shall never be put out."

The first four of the following Extracts are taken from the Disputation at Oxford, April, 1554.

I.

"The conclusions whereunto I must answer are these:—

1. "The first is, that in the sacrament of the altar, by the virtue of God's Word pronounced by the priest, there is really and naturally the very body of Christ present, as it was conceived of the Virgin Mary, under the kinds of bread and wine. And, in like manner, His blood [in the cup.]

"To these I answer:

"Concerning the first conclusion, methinketh it is set forth with certain new terms, lately found, that be obscure, and do not sound according to the Scripture. Nevertheless, however I understand it, thus do I answer, although not without peril [of my life.] I say, That there is *none other presence of Christ required than a spiritual presence;* and

this presence is sufficient for a Christian man, as the presence by the which we both abide in Christ, and Christ in us, to the obtaining of eternal life, if we persevere [in His true Gospel.] And the same presence may be called a *real presence*, [because to the *faithful believer* there is the real, or spiritual body of Christ]: which thing I here rehearse, lest some sycophant or scorner should suppose me, with the Anabaptist, to make nothing else of the Sacrament but a bare and naked sign. As for that which is feigned of many, I, for my part, take it for a Papistical invention. And therefore I think it utterly to be rejected [from among God's children, that seek their Saviour in faith; and be taught among the fleshly Papists, that will be again under the yoke of Antichrist."] (Remains, P.S. Edit., pp. 251, 252.)

II.

Weston:—"The time hath been when you said Mass full devoutly."

Latimer:—"Yea, I cry God mercy heartily for it."

Weston:—"Where learned you this newfangleness?"

Latimer:—"I have long sought for the truth in this matter of the Sacrament, and have not been of this mind past seven years: and my lord of Canterbury's book hath especially confirmed my judgment herein. If I could remember all therein contained, I would not fear to answer any man in this matter." (Ibid, p. 265.)

III.

Tresham :—"Now, that the truth may the better appear, ... here I ask of you, whether Christ, speaking these words, did mean of His flesh to be eaten with the mouth, or of the spiritual eating of the same?"

Latimer :—"I answer, (as Augustine understandeth) that Christ meant of the spiritual eating of His flesh."

Tresham :—"Of what flesh meant Christ? His true flesh, or no?"

Latimer :—"Of His true flesh, *spiritually to be eaten*, in the Supper, *by faith*, and not corporally." (Ibid, p. 266.)

IV.

"He gave not His body to be received with the mouth, but He gave *the Sacrament of His body* to be *received with the mouth:* He gave *the Sacrament to the mouth, His* BODY TO THE MIND."—(Ibid, p. 267.)

V.

"He sheweth unto us how we shall eat Him, in what manner and form; namely, *spiritually*, to *our great comfort:* so that whosoever eateth the mystical bread, and drinketh the mystical wine worthily, according to the ordinance of Christ, *he receiveth surely the very body and blood of Christ spiritually*, as it shall be most comfortable unto his soul. He *eateth with the mouth of his soul*, and *digesteth with the stomach of his soul*, the body of Christ. And to be short: *whosoever believeth* in Christ, putteth his hope, trust, and

confidence in Him, *he eateth and drinketh Him:* for the *spiritual eating is the right eating* to everlasting life; not the corporal eating, as the Capernaites understood it. For that same corporal eating on which they set their minds, hath no commodities at all: it is a spiritual meat that feedeth our souls." (Sermons, P.S. Edit., pp. 458, 459.)

VI.

"So likewise go to the Lord's Supper: when the bread is consecrated, when the words are spoken over it, then it is such an office that it *beareth the name of the body and blood of Christ.* Like as the magistrates because of their office are called Dii, 'gods,' so the bread presenteth His body, so that we go unto it worthily, and receive it with *a good faith. Then* we be assured that *we feed upon Him spiritually.* And like as the bread nourisheth the body, so THE SOUL FEEDETH *upon the very body and blood of Christ by faith,* BY BELIEVING HIM TO BE A SAVIOUR *which delivered man from his sin.*" (Sermon in Remains, P. S. Edit., p. 127.)

VII.

"So that it is needless to have such offerers. . . . . What meaneth St. Paul, when he saith, 'They that preach the Gospel shall live of the Gospel'? Whereas he should (rather) have said, The Lord hath ordained, that they that sacrifice at Mass, should live of the sacrificing. . . . . For I am sure, if God would have had a new kind of sacrificing priest at Mass, then He or some of His apostles would have made some mention thereof in their Master, Christ's will.

. . . . But He spake never a word of sacrificing, or saying of Mass; . . . . Therefore, sacrificing priests should now cease for ever: for now all men ought to offer their own bodies a quick sacrifice, holy and acceptable before God." (Ibid, pp. 254, 255.)

VIII.

"If Christ offered in His Supper, for whom, I pray you? For all. Then His latter oblation made on the cross cannot be thought to be done for all men, for it was not done for them for whom the oblation was made in the Supper; except, peradventure, He offered twice for the self-same, and that should argue the unperfectness of the sacrifice. 'Feed ye, as much as in you lieth, the flock of Christ:' nay, sacrifice rather for the flock of Christ, if the matter be as it is pretended; and it is marvel that Peter did forget so high an office, seeing in these days sacrificing is so much esteemed, preaching almost nothing at all. Who art thou, if thou ceasest to feed? A good catholic. But who art thou, if thou ceasest to sacrifice and say mass? At the least, an heretic! From whence come these perverse judgments, except, peradventure, they think that in sacrificing they feed, and then what needeth a learned pastor? Seeing no man is so foolish, but he can soon learn to sacrifice and say mass. Paul wrote two epistles to Timothy, and one to Titus, two clergymen. He made also a long sermon *ad clerum*, but not one word of this mass sacrifice, which could not have been done, if there had been such a one, and so highly to be esteemed. I have read over of late the New

Testament three or four times deliberately; yet can I not find there neither the Popish consecration, nor yet their transubstantiation, nor their oblation, nor their adoration, which be the very sinews and marrow-bones of the Mass. Christ could not be offered, but propitiatorily; yet now, *Hoc facite*, 'Do this,' must be as much as to say, 'Sacrifice and offer My body under a piece of bread,' available, but we cannot tell how much. Ah! thieves, have ye robbed the realm with your sacrifice of lands and goods; and now cannot tell how much your sacrifice is available?" (Latimer, in Ridley's Works, P. S. Edit., p. 112.)

Ponet.

John Ponet, (or Poynet, or Poinet) born 1516, was eminent among the Reforming Theologians of the reign of Edward VI. The Catechism, called Edward the Sixth's Catechism, was from his pen. It was published by Royal Authority under the advice of Cranmer and Ridley. He was made bishop of Rochester in 1546, and removed to Winchester in 1551. On the accession of Mary he retired to Strasburg, where he died in 1556.

We take the name of bishop Ponet next after Ridley and Latimer, on account of the importance attached to his testimony, and the claim which has been made upon it by those who maintain the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence.

I.

"And whosoever *eateth this flesh and drinketh this blood* with the *mouth of belief, that this very flesh of Christ was put to death for him, and this very blood was once shed for him*, he shall have everlasting life, and the Lord will raise him

again at the latter day." (Quoted in Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 783.)

II.

"There is another kind of eating of Christ's body, and drinking of His blood, and that is called eating and drinking *sacramentaliter*, sacramentally. And we eat Christ on this fashion as oft as we join the outward signs of bread and wine, (that is to say) the Sacrament of the Holy Communion with our faith and inward belief, receiving a visible testimony of our inward belief in the face of the congregation." (Ibid, pp. 783, 784.)

III.

"Wherefore thus I may conclude, he that believeth, eateth; and HE THAT BELIEVETH NOT, EATETH NOT, *although he eat the sacrament every day in the week.* (Ibid, p. 784.)

IV.

"And for the maintenance of this their erroneous and antichristian opinion they will not stick to say, that Christ's body may be in sundry places at one time, granting that it may be at Rome, at Paris, in London, in Canterbury, and in a thousand other diverse places at once.

"Whereas if ye read the Scriptures through, ye shall *never find*, that Christ's BODY was in TWO *places at* ONE *time*, or that after His resurrection it appeared in TWO *sundry places at* ONE *time*." (Ibid, p. 785.)

V.

"We must take heed (saith St. Austin) that we do not so affirm the divinity of His manhood, that we take away

thereby of the TRUTH of His BODY. And St. Austin doth plainly affirm that this body must be in one place of heaven, whereas it pleaseth His Divine Majesty to be." (Ibid, p. 785.)

VI.

"Why, but what mean I to say so? This gear seemeth to be quite contrary to all that ever I have said before; His body is in heaven, and His body is present at the ministration of the sacrament of His Supper. These sayings seem to be directly repugnant the one of them to the other. To put you out of doubt on this point, ye shall understand that even as the sun which is far off distant is absent from mine eye and yet is present to my sight, even so is Christ's body ABSENT FROM MY MOUTH and yet PRESENT TO MY BELIEF. For my belief ascendeth into heaven, even to that body of Christ which sitteth there at the right hand of God the Father, which is His very true and no fantastical body, flesh, blood, and bone as it was born of the Virgin Mary.

"And when I receive the Holy Communion, *Mea conversatio est in cœlis:* my conversation is in heaven: where Christ's body is even so present to my faith as the sun is present to my sight, and as the bread and wine be present to my mouth. *So that if I have no faith,* CHRIST IS NOT PRESENT TO ME *when I receive the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.* If I have faith, Christ's body being in heaven in one only place, is PRESENT TO MY FAITH; and when I receive the Holy Communion I embrace Him by faith, even flesh, blood and bone as He was born of the

Virgin Mary. And so do all men throughout the whole world hang upon Him, and comfort themselves with that only body, being in one place of heaven, though they be dispersed into never so many sundry places throughout the world." (Ibid, 787.)

Philpot.

John Philpot, born in 1511, a great Hebrew scholar, was admitted 'true fellow' of New College, Oxford, in 1534. He spent some time in foreign travel, and on his return gave evidence of the change in his religious views. Gardiner bishop of Winchester would have suppressed his teaching, but could not. In Edward's reign he was made Archdeacon of Winchester. In Mary's reign he was imprisoned, and burnt at Smithfield, Dec. 18, 1555. In Bonner's address to him, he said "You have offended and trespassed against the Sacrament of the Altar, denying the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood to be there, affirming also material bread and material wine to be in the sacrament, and not the substance of the body and blood of Christ" (See Examination, P. S. Edit. p. 151.)

The following Extracts are from Philpot's Examinations before the Queen's Commissioner's, commencing October 1555, the same year in which he suffered.

1.

"But bodily to *be present*, and bodily to *be absent*; to be *on earth*, and to be *in heaven*, and all at *one present time*; be things CONTRARY TO THE NATURE OF A HUMAN BODY: ergo, it cannot be said of the human body of Christ, that the selfsame body is both in heaven, and also in earth at one instant, either VISIBLY OR INVISIBLY." (Examinations, P. S. Edit. p. 208.)

II.

"I allow the Church of Geneva, and the doctrine of the same; for it is *una, catholica, et apostolica,* and doth follow the doctrine that the apostles did preach; and THE DOCTRINE TAUGHT AND PREACHED IN KING EDWARD'S DAYS WAS ALSO ACCORDING TO THE SAME. And are ye not ashamed to persecute me and others for your Church's sake, which is Babylonical, and contrary to the true Catholic Church?" (Ibid, 153.)

III.

"Wherefore, unless you can declare by the word, that Christ is otherwise present with us than spiritually and sacramentally by grace, as He hath taught us, you *pretend* THE OMNIPOTENCY OF GOD IN VAIN."

London :—"Why, wilt thou not say that Christ is *really present* in the Sacrament? or do you deny it?"

Philpot :—"I deny not that Christ is *really in the sacrament* TO THE RECEIVER THEREOF according to Christ's institution." (Ibid, 62.)

IV.

Chedsey :—"Why, then you would not have it to be the body of Christ, *unless it be received?*"

Philpot :—"No, VERILY, it is NOT the very body of Christ *to any other*, but such as *condignly* RECEIVE THE SAME *after his institution.*" (Ibid, p. 67.)

V.

Chamberlain :—"I pray you, my Lord, let me ask him one question. WHAT KIND OF PRESENCE *in the sacrament*

(duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance) do you allow?"

Philpot:—"If any come worthily to receive, then do I *confess* THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST wholly to be, *with all* THE FRUITS OF HIS PASSION, *unto the said* WORTHY RECEIVER, by the Spirit of God, and that Christ is thereby joined to him and he to Christ." (Ibid, p. 68.)

VI.

"But the sacrament be to be considered according to the word which Christ spake of them; of the which, 'Take ye, and eat ye' be some of the chief, concurrent to the making of the same, without the which there can be no sacraments." (Ibid, p. 61, 69.)

VII.

Philpot:—"Error, that I know, I hold none: of the Catholic Church I am sure I am."

Worcester:—"The Catholic Church doth acknowledge a REAL PRESENCE of Christ in the sacrament, and so will not you."

Philpot:—"That is not so: for I acknowledge a VERY ESSENTIAL PRESENCE in the sacrament duly used."

Worcester:—"What! a real presence?"

Philpot:—"Yea, A REAL PRESENCE *by the Spirit of God in the* right administration." (Ibid, p. 130.)

VIII.

Philpot:—"I do acknowledge (as I have said) a REAL PRESENCE *of the sacrament*, in the due administration thereof, to THE WORTHY RECEIVERS, by the Spirit of God. (Ibid, 132.)

Chedsey :—". . . . . I hear say you do confess A REAL PRESENCE: but I will be hanged, if you will abide by it: you will deny it by and by."

Philpot :—"That I have said, I cannot deny; neither intend, whatsoever you say."

Chedsey :—"If there be A REAL PRESENCE in the sacrament, then EVIL MEN RECEIVE CHRIST: which thing you will not grant, I am sure."

Philpot :—"I deny the argument; for I do not grant in THE SACRAMENT by transubstantiation ANY REAL PRESENCE, as you falsely imagine; but in *the due administration to* THE WORTHY RECEIVERS." (Ibid, p. 133.)

IX.

Christopherson :—"Doth not St. Augustine call it the sacrament of the altar? How say you to that?"

Philpot :—"That maketh nothing for the probation of your sacrament. For so he, with other ancient writers, do call the Holy Communion or Supper of the Lord, in respect that it is the sacrament of the sacrifice which Christ offered upon the altar of the cross, the which sacrifice all the altars and sacrifices done upon the altars in the old law did prefigure and shadow; the which pertaineth nothing to your sacrament hanging upon you altars of lime and stone."

Christopherson :—"No doth? I pray you what signifieth "altar?"

Philpot :—"Not as you falsely take it materially, but but for the sacrifice of the altar of the cross." (Ibid p. 119.)

Bradford.

John Bradford, born probably about 1510, entered the Inner Temple as a student of common law 1547, when his character underwent a great change, through the instrumentality, it is said, of his friend Sampson. A year after Ridley invited him to be a fellow of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, where he took the degree of M.A. in 1549. In 1550 Ridley, then Bishop of London, obtained for him a license to preach, made him one of his chaplains, and lodged him in his own house. In 1551 he was appointed one of the six chaplains of Edward VI., chosen to be "*itineraries*, to preach sound doctrine in all the remotest parts of the kingdom." On the accession of Mary he "still continued diligent in preaching, until he was unjustly deprived of both his office and liberty." He wrote to the men of Lancashire and Cheshire from his prison—"The chief thing which I am condemned for as an heretic is, because I deny in the sacrament of the altar (which is not Christ's Supper, but a plain perversion, as the Papists now use it) to be a real, natural, and corporal presence of Christ's body and blood under the forms and accidents of bread and wine; that is, because I deny transubstantiation, which is the darling of the devil, and daughter and heir to Antichrist's religion." "He endured the flame as a fresh gale of wind on a hot summer's day, without any reluctancy, confirming by his death the truth of that doctrine he had so diligently and powerfully preached during his life."

The first Extract is from a Sermon on the Lord's Supper, which appears to have been submitted to Ridley "to peruse and judge thereof." In returning it, Ridley wrote (1554) "Blessed be God that hath given you liberty . . . . that you may use your pen to His glory, and to the comfort, as I hear say, of many." (See Sermons, etc., P. S. Edit., p.82.)

I.

"If there be no substance of bread in the sacrament, but transubstantiation, *then Christ's body is* RECEIVED OF THE UNGODLY and eaten with their teeth: which is *not only against St. Austin* calling this speech, "Except you eat the

flesh of the Son of Man," etc., to be "a figurative speech;" but also AGAINST THE PLAIN SCRIPTURES, which affirm them to dwell in Christ and Christ in them, and they *to have everlasting life that eat Him;* which *the wicked have not,* although they eat the sacrament. 'He that eateth of this bread,' saith Christ, 'shall live for evermore.' Therefore *they* EAT NOT CHRIST'S BODY, but, as Paul saith, 'they eat judgment and damnation;' which I trow be *another manner of thing than Christ's body.* And this doth St. Austin affirm, saying, '*None* DO EAT CHRIST'S BODY, which is not in the body of Christ;' that is, as he expoundeth it, 'in whom Christ dwelleth not, and he in Christ:' which thing THE WICKED DO NOT, because they want *faith and the Holy Spirit, which be* THE MEANS WHEREBY CHRIST IS RECEIVED." (Sermons, etc., Parker Society Edition, p. 91.)

II.

"'Why,' quoth he, 'didst thou not deny Christ's presence in the sacrament?'

"'No,' quoth Bradford, 'I never denied nor taught, but that TO FAITH whole *Christ's body and blood* was as present as bread and wine TO THE DUE RECEIVER.'

"'Yea, but dost thou not believe that Christ's body naturally and *really is there, under the form of bread and wine?*'

"'My lord,' quoth Bradford, 'I believe *Christ is present there* to the FAITH *of the due receiver:* as for transubstantiation, I plainly and flatly tell you, I believe it not.'

"Here was Bradford called *diabolus,* 'a slanderer;' 'For

we ask NO QUESTION,' quoth the lord-chancellor, "of transubstantiation, but of CHRIST'S BODILY PRESENCE.'

"'Why,' quoth Bradford, 'I deny not *His presence to* THE FAITH OF THE RECEIVER, but *deny* that He is INCLUDED IN THE BREAD, or that the bread is transubstantiated.'

"'If He be not included,' quoth the Bishop of Worcester, 'how is He then present?'

"'Forsooth,' quoth Bradford, 'my faith knoweth how, though my tongue cannot express it, nor you otherwise than by faith hear it, or understand it.'

"Here was much ado now, one doctor starting up and speaking this, another that, and the lord-chancellor talking much of Luther, Zuinglius, and Œcolampadius: but still Bradford kept them at this point, that *Christ is* PRESENT TO FAITH, and that there is no transubstantiation nor *including of Christ in the bread:* but all this would not serve them.

"Therefore another bishop asked this question,—*Whether the* WICKED MAN RECEIVED CHRIST'S VERY BODY OR NO? And Bradford answered plainly, 'No.' Whereat the lord-chancellor made a long oration, how that *it could not be that Christ* WAS PRESENT, except that the *evil man receive Him.*

"But Bradford put his oration away in few words, that grace was at that present offered to his lordship, although he received it not: 'So that,' quoth he, '*the receiving* MAKETH NOT THE PRESENCE, as your lordship would affirm; but *God's grace, truth, and power, is the cause of* THE PRESENCE, the which the *wicked* THAT LACKETH FAITH CANNOT RECEIVE.'" (Ibid, pp. 488, 489.)

III.

"'Your Church hath taken something too much upon her to excommunicate me for that which, by the testimony of my lord of Duresme in his book of the Sacrament lately put forth, was free of many an hundred years after Christ, to believe or not believe.'

"'What is that?' quoth he.

"'Transubstantiation,' said I.

"'Why, you are not condemned therefore only,' quod he.

"'*Yes*,' quoth I, '*that am I*, and *because I deny that* WICKED MEN DO RECEIVE CHRIST'S BODY.'

"'No,' quoth he, 'you agree not with us *in the presence*, nor in nothing else.'

"'How you believe,' quoth I, 'you know: for my part, *I confess a presence of whole Christ*, God and man, *to the faith of the receiver*.'

"'No,' quoth he, 'you must believe A REAL PRESENCE *in the sacrament*.'

"'In the Sacrament?' quoth I. 'No, I will not shut Him up, nor *tie Him to it*, otherwise than *faith seeth* and permitteth. If I should *include Christ's* REAL PRESENCE in the sacrament, or *tie Him to it* otherwise than to THE FAITH OF THE RECEIVER, then THE WICKED MAN SHOULD RECEIVE HIM; which I DO NOT, nor WILL NOT believe by God's grace.'" (Ibid, pp. 510, 511.)

IV.

"'The wicked,' saith Master Harpsfield, 'do receive the VERY BODY OF CHRIST, but NOT THE GRACE *of His body*.'

"'No,' quoth I, '*they receive* NOT THE BODY; for Christ's body is no dead carcass: *he that receiveth it receiveth the Spirit,* which is not without grace, I ween.'" (Ibid, p. 512.)

V.

"Here Master Pendleton was something abashed, as appeareth by his fumbling in his speech.

"'Master Bradford,' quod he, 'I do not know wherefor you are condemned.'

"'Marry,' quod I, '*transubstantiation is the thing whereof I am condemned,* and also *the denial of* WICKED MEN TO RECEIVE CHRIST'S BODY.'" (Ibid, p. 542.)

VI.

"'You deny *the presence,*' quoth my lord of York.

"'I do *not,*' quoth I, 'to *the faith of the worthy receiver.*'

"'Why,' quoth he, 'what is that than to say that Christ LIETH NOT ON THE ALTAR?'

"'No, my lord,' quoth I, 'indeed I BELIEVE NOT SUCH A PRESENCE.'" (Ibid, p. 522.)

VII.

"The sacrifice of Christ for the redemption of the world was not simply 'His body and His blood,' but 'His body broken and His blood shed;' that is, all His passion and suffering in His body and flesh. In that therefore they offer, as they say, the same sacrifice which Christ offered, dearly beloved, do they not, as much as in them is . . . . . crucify Christ again? . . . . . .

Whereas they call this sacrifice of the mass, the principal mean to apply the benefit of Christ's death to the quick and

dead, I would gladly have them to shew, where and of whom they learned it. Sure I am, they learned it not of Christ, for when He sent His disciples abroad to apply unto men the benefit of His death, He bade them not mass it, but preach the Gospel, as the mean by the which God had appointed believers to be saved." (Letters and Treatises, P. S. Edit., p. 287.)

Hooper.

John Hooper (or Hoper or Houper) was born about the close of the fifteenth century. He was educated at Oxford, and embraced the monastic life. After the dissolution of the monasteries was kindly received at Zurich by Bullinger. In 1548 he returned to England and was nominated to the bishopric of Gloucester in 1550. On Mary's accession he was committed to the Fleet, in Sept. 1553. He was condemned in Jan. 1555, taken to Gloucester, and burnt near to his own cathedral. Foxe says "Tunstall asked him to say 'whether he believed the CORPORAL PRESENCE in the sacrament, and Master Hooper said plainly that there was none such, neither did he believe any such thing.' Whereupon they bade the notaries write that he was married and would not go from his wife, and that he believed not the CORPORAL PRESENCE in the sacrament: therefore he was worthy to be deprived of his bishopric."

The first Extract is from "A brief and clear Confession of the Christian faith," first published in 1550.

I.

"I believe that *all this Sacrament consisteth* in *the use thereof;* so that without the *right use* the bread and wine *in nothing differ* from other common bread and wine that is commonly used; and therefore I do *not believe* that the *body of Christ* can be *contained, hid, or inclosed* in the bread, *under the bread,* or *with the bread;* neither the blood *in the*

wine, under the wine, or with the wine. But I believe and confess the very body of Christ to be in heaven on the right hand of the Father (as before we have said); and that always and as often as we *use this bread and wine* according to the ordinance and institution of Christ, *we do verily and indeed receive His body and blood.*

I believe that this receiving is not done *carnally or bodily,* but *spiritually,* through a *true and lively faith;* that is to say, the body and blood of Christ are not *given* to the *mouth and belly* for the nourishing of the body, but *unto* OUR FAITH for the nourishing of the spirit and inward man unto eternal life. And for that cause we have *no need that Christ should come from heaven to us, but that we should ascend unto Him,* lifting up our hearts through a lively faith on high unto the right hand of the Father, where Christ sitteth, from whence we wait for our redemption; and we must not seek for Christ in these bodily elements.

"I believe that this Holy Supper is a sacrament of faith unto *the faithful only,* and not for the infidels: wherein a man findeth and receiveth no more than he bringeth with him, saving peradventure the increase of faith, grace, and virtue. And therefore they only find and receive Jesus Christ unto salvation, which through true and lively faith bring the same with them: but the others find and *receive* ONLY THE OUTWARD AND VISIBLE SIGNS, and that to their condemnation, as Judas and other such like wicked and reprobate." (Later Writings, P. S. Edit., p. 49.)

II.

"Which sacrament is not a bare sign and token of His death only, as many men imagine, as the picture of Hercles is Hercles, or the image of Jupiter to be Jupiter: but I put as much difference between the sacraments of Christ, and all other signs and tokens not appointed for sacraments, as I do between the seal of a prince, that is annexed unto the writing or charter that containeth all the prince's right and title that he hath unto his realm, and the king's arms painted in a glass window. Such seals, annexed unto so weighty writings, be no less esteemed than the whole right, title, or claim that is confirmed by the seal, though the matter of the seal be nothing but wax, not for the value of the matter, (for twopence will buy ten times as much wax,) but for the use that the matter is appointed unto. And he that would take upon him to deny the king's seal in such a purpose, and say, it is but a piece of wax, it were no less than treason, and a very contempt of the king himself; because the king hath appointed that seal to be *honourably received and reverently used of all men.* And as the writings sealed doth confirm and declare the right of the owner unto all the world; so doth the sacraments confirm the assurance of everlasting life unto the faithfuls, and declareth the same to all the world. And as the matter, substance, and land itself is *not corporally nor really contained* in the writing, nor *annexed to the writing,* neither *brought* (when any matter of controversy is for the land) before the judge *with the writing; no more is the* CORPORAL BODY OF CHRIST *brought*

before the Church, NEQUE CUM PANE, NEQUE IN PANE, NEQUE SUB PANE, NEQUE PER PANEM, NEQUE ANTE PANEM, NEQUE POST PANEM.

"But when the minister delivereth unto me the thing that is in his power to deliver, to say, the bread and wine, rehearsing the words of Christ's institution, the Holy Ghost *delivereth unto my faith*, which is mounted and ascended into heaven, the PRECIOUS BODY AND BLOOD OF MY SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST *spiritually, and not corporally.* So doth *the merits of this precious body* in *heaven feed my poor wretched soul upon the earth;* and *no contradiction or impossibility for Christ's body so to do.* It may be in heaven, and yet *extend* HIS VIRTUE by the operation of the Holy Ghost into my soul, *by the means of faith*, which at the time of the receiving of this sacrament is in my soul, and out of my soul; as the Spirit of God is in every godly heart, and out of the heart in heaven with God: so was God, at the creation of man unto His own likeness, in man and out of man. Yet to make it more plain, as the sun in heaven doth extend down his beams and lighten the earth, so doth Christ's body by faith, in spirit, expulse all darkness and sin out of the heart; moveth not bodily, but is everywhere, where faith is, spiritually, and at one time." (Early Writings, P. S. Edit., pp. 190—192.)

III.

"The Count Palatine has lately provided for the preaching of the Gospel throughout his dominions; but as far as relates to the Eucharist he has descended, as the proverb

has it, from the horse to the ass; for he has fallen from popery into the doctrine of Luther, who is in that particular more erroneous than all the papists; and those who deny the substance of bread to remain in the sacrament, and substitute the body of Christ in its place, come more closely to the truth than those who affirm that the natural Body of Christ is with the bread, in the bread, and under the form of bread, and yet occupies no place." (Letter to Bullinger in Original Letters, P. S. Edit., i., pp. 37-8.)

Hutchinson.

Roger Hutchinson was educated at Cambridge, where he was admitted fellow of St. John's, 1543. He died a natural death in 1555 or 1556.

The quotations are mostly taken from "The Image of God, or Laymen's Book," first published in 1550, with a dedicatory Epistle to Archbishop Cranmer.

I.

"You will ask me then, whether we receive Christ's body? *Yea, truly,* from heaven, from the right hand of the Father; *not out of the bread, nor in the bread.* For, unless we eat His flesh, and drink His blood, we shall not dwell in Him; we shall not arise at the last day; we shall not have eternal life. Christ's humanity is the mean whereby we must obtain all things; the way by which we must climb up to heaven." (Works, P. S. Edit., p. 35.)

II.

"But peradventure the papists will reply, If it be meat, then is it received both of good and evil men; for neither of

both sorts can live without meat. To this I answer, it is the meat of the soul, not of the body; the food of the spirit, not of the flesh; and therefore it is NOT RECEIVED OF EVIL PERSONS, because the *meat is good*, and *they be evil*. So that this is a strong argument; Christ's flesh and blood is meat; *ergo* it is NOT RECEIVED OF EVIL MEN." (Ibid, p. 42.)

III.

"To eat Christ's flesh and to drink His blood, is *to believe* that the Son of God concerning His humanity and flesh, was *nailed on the Cross, and that His blood was let forth for the expiation of our sins*, and for our redemption and righteousness, and to repose us again into God's favour. And this spiritual receipt, which is *by faith, is so effectual*, and of so mighty and so vehement an operation, that, as matrimony maketh man and wife one flesh according as it is written, *erunt duo in carne una*, so it joineth us unto Christ *reipsa*, that is, *really, truly, and effectually*, making us flesh of His flesh and bones of His bones, as Paul witnesseth; that is, lively, holy, and very members of His mystical body. . . . God's *holy Word knoweth* NO OTHER RECEIPT OF CHRIST'S VERY BODY and natural flesh, neither *in the sacrament nor without it*." (Ibid, pp. 262, 263.)

IV.

"Throughout the Scriptures this word 'unworthily' is never joined with Christ's body, never with His blood; for *they* do *sanctify* their receivers. St. Austin also denieth this distinction, writing thus: 'He that abideth not in

Christ, and in whom Christ abideth not, without doubt he eateth not Christ's flesh nor drinketh not His blood, although he eat and drink the sacrament of so great a thing unto His damnation.'" (Ibid, p. 264.)

V.

"And Prosper, in his Book of Sentences, saith of such unworthy receivers, that though every day indifferently they do receive, that they eat the sacrament and figure of so great a thing unto the condemnation of their presumption, and NOT CHRIST'S BODY. Bede also hath the very same words. And the famous and learned father St. Hierome doth confirm this to be a true doctrine, writing upon the sixty-sixth chapter of the prophet Esay, 'As long,' saith this elder and godly father of Christ's Church, 'as long as they be not holy and clean in body and in spirit, they do not eat the flesh of Jesu, nor taste of His blood.' Of these it is evident that, as the sensible sacrament is received unworthily of ungodly men unto condemnation; so THE BODY OF CHRIST, which is the bread of life, IS ONLY RECEIVED WORTHILY and OF GOOD MEN, *always unto salvation*, expiation, and righteousness, and of no man unto destruction, death, and damnation, whosoever is partaker of it; as St. Austin saith in his sermon of the holy feast of passover. Therefore, if we say *that ungodly men do eat Christ's flesh*, we deny the doctrine of all the elder fathers; we deny Christ to be the bread of life; we deny Him to be our righteousness, our saving health, our expiation, our ransom, our sanctification and holiness; who will not fail to deny us

likewise before His Father, unless we renounce this devilish error." (Ibid, p. 265.)

VI.

"That the Lord's Supper, which men call the mass, is not a sacrifice for sin, St. Paul declareth plainly, saying: *Sine sanguinis effusione*, etc., 'that without shedding of blood no sacrifice can blot out sin.' If Christ be sacrificed or offered in His Supper, for the expiation of sin, His precious and most comfortable blood is shed again, is poured forth again: for without bloodshed is no remission." (Ibid, p. 48.)

VII.

"Wherefore the Supper of the Lord is no *sacrifice* for sin, forasmuch as it is a *sacrament*. Mark this difference, brethren, and be no longer deceived. The parable of the thieves teacheth us, that Christ's coming hath disannulled all such priesthood as is called *sacerdotium;* but *presbyterium* remaineth. The priests and Levites pass by, and leave the wounded man, which was robbed going from Hierusalem to Jericho, unholpen, unprovided for." (Ibid, p. 49.)

VIII.

"Moreover, mark what I say unto thee. Read over all the New Testament, and thou shalt not find once this word, *sacerdos*, 'priest,' applied or spoken of any one sort of ministers (as the common sort do use it), but when it is referred to the Pharisees, and to such as do appertain without all doubt to the Old Testament. It is referred always to all Christian people, which all be *sacerdotes* through Christ:

and ministers have *no manner of sacrifice*, but common with the laity, both men and women; that is to say, the *sacrifice of thanksgiving*, and the quick and lively *oblation of their own bodies*. The New Testament requireth *no other sacrifice*." (Ibid, p. 50.)

IX.

"Moreover, as Christ did not ordain His Supper to be received privately for benefactors either dead or alive, or for others, no more did He *elevate* and lift up the sacrament over His head, to be *seen and worshipped* of His disciples. He gave it them into their hands *to eat*, and not *to honour it;* to *receive* it, and *not to worship* it with holding up of their hands and knocks on their breasts. ONLY GOD is to be honoured with this kind of reverence, and NO SACRAMENT; for *God is not a sacrament, neither is the sacrament God*." (Ibid, 230.)

We have thus had before us extracts from the writings of our Reformers of King Edward's reign.

None, I imagine, who have read these extracts with any degree of care, will hesitate for a moment in acknowledging the distinct and strong repugnance of all the writers to the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence.

In the case of Ridley, indeed, it is, perhaps, scarcely to be wondered at that some of his expressions have been thought to look the other way, and have been eagerly fastened on by those who would fain find shelter for their teaching under so great a name. But other extracts which have been before us leave no room whatever to question

what Ridley's views really were. And his own interpretations and explanations of his own expressions afford a good key for the unlocking of difficulties, such as sometimes, perhaps, may be felt in the writings of other Reformers, whose language might otherwise seem to imply either some confusion of mind, or some inconsistency of views.

The truth is that the words "sacrament," "sacramental," "sacramentally," are used in one sense by our Reformers, in quite another sense by our and their opponents.

The word "sacrament" indeed is used by Cranmer and others (as in our Catechism) sometimes as including the inward and spiritual grace, and the whole administration. But more commonly, in the use of our Reformers, (as again in our Catechism also) it stands for *merely* the outward and visible signs in the Lord's Supper, for the elements of bread and wine.

And since to the sacraments (the visible signs) are given the names of the things they signify (according to the usage of the Fathers), the things signified are said (in the language of our Reformers) to be *sacramentally present* wherever their signs are present and *sacramentally received*, whenever the signs (which bear their names) are received. In such language the words "sacramentally present" or "present in a sacrament," indicate nothing more than the presence of the sacrament or outward sign, and the word "sacramentally received" would tell only of the reception of the visible element. To say that the blood is present in the cup "*sacramentally*," or "*in a sacrament*" or "*by way of a sacrament*," is equivalent to saying that the sacrament of the blood (*i.e.* the wine which signifies Christ's blood) is there. So after Ridley had declared that "the cup *is called the blood* (*i.e.* by Chrysostom) because it is *the sacrament of*

the blood," he will not allow Curtop to fasten on that which is in the chalice the name of *blood*, in any other sense (in the sense of "the Real Presence") by distinguishing between the *sacrament* of the blood and the *blood*, but he maintains "The sacrament of the blood *is* the blood, (*i.e.* in the language of Chrysostom) and that is attributed to the sacrament, (*i.e.* of course by Chrysostom) which is spoken of the thing of the sacrament."

Thus it will be seen that the words "sacramental" and "sacramentally" exclude the sense of "real" and "really," and are indeed distinctly opposed to them. Quite as much as the phrases "representative presence" and "figurative presence" would be inconsistent with *actual* presence, and the phrases "representatively present," and "figuratively present," and "present by representation," and "present in a figure," and "present in a picture," would necessarily imply *actual absence;* quite so much in the language of our Reformers (who in this matter, believed at least, that they were following the example of the ancient Fathers) would the phrases "sacramental presence," "sacramentally present," "present in a sacrament," "present by way of a sacrament," "symbolically present," "present in mystery," and the like, necessarily EXCLUDE *the* REAL *presence* of the things signified by the present sacraments or outward signs. This is the more carefully to be observed, because in the language of the Church of Rome, as well as in that of those who now maintain the doctrine of "the Real Objective Presence," the words "sacramental" and "sacramentally," include the idea of intense *reality* of Presence, however that Presence may be regarded as supernatural and ineffable. And thus if the distinction of meanings be not carefully observed, we may be apt to fall into great confu-

sion, and may easily be led to play with quotations at cross purposes.

The next paper will be taken up with extracts from our Reforming Divines of the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

No. III.

VIEWS OF OUR REFORMERS:

REFORMING DIVINES OF THE REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

In this Paper no attempt is made to classify the writers. It contains extracts from the writings of our Reforming Divines in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, their names following one another in alphabetical order.

Becon.

Thomas Becon, born 1511 or 1512, was educated at Cambridge, where he was a diligent hearer of Latimer. He was ordained about 1538. Under the act of the Six Articles, "he was compelled, besides suffering, it would seem, some imprisonment, to make a public submission." On the accession of Edward, he became rector of St. Stephen, Walbrook, and was made by Cranmer one of the six preachers of Canterbury Cathedral. Subsequently he became chaplain to the Duke of Somerset. On Mary's accession he was committed to the Tower as a seditious preacher, with Bradford and Veron. Being released he retired to Strasburgh. On the death of Mary he returned to England, and in the Convocation of 1562 voted in favour of the six propositions for the omission of some ceremonies. The propositions were rejected by a majority of one. He was a friend of Archbishop Parker, and sincerely attached to the Church of England. He died about 1570.

The following extracts are taken from "The Catechism set forth dialogue-wise in familiar talk between the father and the son."

It has a Preface addressed to Becon's children, concluding thus, "Take it, therefore, with joyful hearts, as a testimony of your father's goodwill toward you; yea, receive it as your patrimony . . . . And I shall most humbly beseech God to be your father and defender, and to give you His Holy Spirit, which may govern you in all your doings, that ye may walk blameless in His sight, and be found in the number of God's elect."

I.

Father:—"Why, is not the very natural body of Christ eaten of the communicants both faithful and unfaithful at the Lord's Supper?"

Son:—"Christ is ONLY *received and eaten of the* FAITHFUL *communicants;* the unfaithful *receive* NOT *the Body and Blood of Christ*, but the *sacraments of the same* ONLY, yea, and that unto their damnation."

Father:—"And is Christ received *corporally* with the *corporal mouth* of the faithful communicants?"

Son:—"The natural Body of Christ is *only in heaven;* and, notwithstanding, the soul of the faithful communicant with her mouth, that is to say, *with* FAITH, doth truly and unfeignedly feed upon it unto her great joy and comfort, and feeleth no less true refection than the body doth by receiving corporal food; yea, the faithful communicant, thus eating and receiving Christ, receiveth both in body and soul an heavenly nourishment, a singular comfort, and an unoutspeakable joy."

Father:—"Faith then is the mouth of the soul, wherewith Christ is received and eaten."

Son:—"Yea, verily, as Christ saith: 'I am that bread

of life. He that cometh unto me shall not hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.'" (Catechism, etc., P. S. Edit., p. 295.)

II.

Father:—"What shall we then say to the ancient Fathers of Christ's Church, which in many places call the Supper of the Lord a sacrifice?"

Son:—"'Even as images are wont to be called, (as St. Austin saith,) by the names of those things whereof they are images, as when we behold a table or wall painted we say, that is Cicero, that is Sallustius;' so likewise, forasmuch as the celebration of the Lord's Supper is a certain representative image of the passion of Christ, which is the alone true sacrifice, therefore, the holy Fathers many times call the Lord's Supper a sacrifice. Now, if the Lord's Supper be *not properly a sacrifice*, but only a *memorial of the true sacrifice*, which is the passion and death of Christ; how can the massing papists brag that their Mass (in the which many things are done contrary to the institution of Christ) is a propitiatory, satisfactory, and expiatory sacrifice for the sins of quick and of the dead?" (Ibid, p. 249.)

III.

Son:—"Our Saviour Christ did both institute this holy Supper at a table, and the apostles of Christ also did receive it at a table. And what can be more perfect than that which Christ and his apostles have done? All the primitive Church also received the Supper of the Lord at a table. And St. Paul, speaking of the Lord's Supper, maketh

mention not of an altar, but of a table, 'Ye cannot be partakers,' saith he, 'of the Lord's table, and of the devil's table also.' Tables for the ministration of the Lord's Supper continued in the Church of Christ almost three hundred years after Christ universally, and in some places longer, as histories make mention; so that the use of altars is but a new invention, and brought in, as some write, by Pope Sixtus, the second of that name.

"Moreover, an altar hath relation to a sacrifice. And altars in the old law were built and set up at the commandment of God to offer sacrifice upon them. But *all those sacrifices do now cease*, (for they were but shadows of good things to come,) therefore the *altars ought to cease* with them. Christ alone is our altar, our sacrifice, and our priest. Our altar is in heaven. Our altar is not made of stone, but of flesh and blood; of whom the apostle writeth thus: 'We have an altar, whereof it is not lawful for them to eat which serve in the tabernacle.'" (Ibid, p. 297.)

IV.

"Of these words of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ it is manifest, plain, and evident, that the virtue and power of His flesh and blood is so great and mighty, that whosoever eateth and drinketh thereof shall live for ever, and have everlasting life. But the wicked and *unfaithful*, although they eat the sacramental bread and drink the sacramental wine, have not everlasting life, as we have Judas for an example: therefore it followeth, that *the wicked and* UNFAITHFUL *do* NOT *eat nor drink the body and blood of Christ.* (Ibid, p. 292.)

v

"He said not, Behold, fall down and worship. The worshipping therefore of the sacrament ought utterly to be forbidden and to be abolished, as mere idolatry and most execrable abomination before the Lord our God, to whom alone all worship, honour, and glory is due." (Ibid, p. 301.)

Bilson.

One of the most eminent and learned prelates of Elizabeth's reign was Thomas Bilson, born 1536; Bishop of Worcester, 1596; Bishop of Winchester, 1597 to 1616, who, among various other learned works, published in 1585, when he was Warden of Winchester, one entitled, "The True Difference between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion," to which was added a Dedicatory Epistle to the Queen.

From this work (one sentence of which has been frequently quoted to prove that Bishop Bilson maintained the objective view of the Presence—See Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 789), the following extracts are made. He took a prominent part in the Hampton Court Conference. Died 1616.

I.

"But the wicked, notwithstanding the corporal chamming of this sacrament, die the death of sinners; *ergo, they neither eat the flesh of Christ, nor drink His blood;* not because their teeth or jaws fail them, but by reason they want faith, which is *the right and proper instrument of spiritual eating.*

"Since, then, man 'believeth with his heart unto righteousness' (Romans x.,) as Paul teacheth, not with his jaws

nor lips; *ergo, the soul of man which* ONLY *believeth,* ONLY *doth eat the flesh of Christ;* and our bodies, which have no means to believe, can neither eat nor drink in that sort and sense that our Saviour there speaketh of.

"*The wicked live not by Christ, neither abide in Christ, and therefore by the very determination of the Lord Himself, they neither eat His flesh, nor drink His blood.* Run now to your distinction of corporal and spiritual eating when you will, but so long as these words stand written in the Gospel, 'He that eateth me, even he shall live by me,' the godly will soon conclude, THAT SUCH AS LIVE NOT BY CHRIST, DO NOT EAT CHRIST: [his own capitals:] and so that corporal eating of Christ's flesh, which you would erect, common to the faithful and faithless, to be no kind of eating at all, notwithstanding they receive the material and external elements of this mystery." (Quoted in Goode on Eucharist, ii., p. 790.)

II.

"The sacraments are carnally pressed with teeth, which they [*i.e.*, the wicked] are partakers of as well as the godly; but *Christ Himself is not eaten with teeth;* and therefore *the wicked, wanting both spirit and faith by which He is received, cannot possibly eat His flesh, or drink His blood, though they come to His table never so often.*" (Ibid, p. 791.)

III.

"The signs which are called after consecration by the names Christ's body and blood, do enter our mouths, and

pass our throats; the true flesh and blood of Christ do not, but are eaten at the Lord's table only of the inward man by faithful devotion and affection, preparing the heart that Christ may lodge there, and dwell there, where He delighteth, and not in the mouths and jaws of men, which is no place for Him THAT SITTETH IN HEAVEN, WHITHER WE MUST FLY WITH THE SPIRITUAL WINGS OF OUR SOULS AND SPIRITS BEFORE WE CAN BE PARTAKERS OF HIM." (Ibid, p. 791.)

IV.

"I trust the godly will be fully resolved, that the manner of eating Christ's flesh and drinking His blood, which the Lord Himself first proposed in the sixth of John, was *not literal nor corporal*, as the Capernites understand Him and were deceived, but *allegorical and spiritual. Allegorical* in respect of the words which be not there precisely taken in their usual signification for grinding with the teeth, and straining down the throat, but *figuratively spoken*, and import as much as *confessing and embracing with heart and inward affection. Spiritual*, because not our mouths, but our minds—not our bellies, but our spirits, are nourished with the flesh and blood of Christ, and that not by chewing or swallowing, but BY REMEMBERING AND BELIEVING THAT HIS BODY WAS WOUNDED, AND HIS BLOOD SHED FOR OUR PERFECT AND ETERNAL REDEMPTION." (Ibid, p. 795.)

V.

"As we doubt not that Christ is always present on His table in *truth, grace, virtue, and effect, if we open the eyes of*

our faith to behold Him, and mouth of our spirits to receive Him, so the local and corporal hiding of His human substance under the shews of bread and wine was never taught by any Catholic Father or Council." (Ibid, p. 801.)

VI.

"By these things we have Him in this world, NOT REALLY, locally, or corporally, but truly, comfortably, and effectually, so as our bodies, souls, and spirits be sanctified and preserved by Him against the day of redemption." (Ibid, p. 800.)

VII.

"[The Fathers] taught Christ to be present *not in flesh but in grace; not in real and corporal existence, but in spiritual and fruitful efficience.* They prepared for Him not their jaws and bellies, but their minds and hearts." (Ibid, pp. 801, 802.)

VIII.

"*For as that part of man, which eateth the flesh of Christ, everteth your real presence,* because no local or corporal substance can enter or feed the soul, and the truth of Christ's flesh in this mystery by the general consent of all ages and churches doth enter and feed the soul; so THE PLACE WHITHER WE MUST ASCEND BEFORE WE CAN EAT THE LORD'S FLESH DOTH CLEARLY CONFUTE THE SAME." (Ibid, p. 802.)

IX.

"Your *Real Presence* and ubiquity, if you will have Christ's human substance dispersed in many places, *without*

shape or circumscription, are THE VERY BOWELS AND INWARDS OF EUTYCHES' HERESY." (Ibid, p. 803.)

X.

Phi, (Romanist) :—"I see you mistake us. You think we adore the forms of bread and wine, when indeed we do not, but rather we adore Christ the Son the living God, and second Person in the Trinity in those mysteries, as St. Ambrose saith, or *as we speak more usually, under those forms of bread and wine.*"

Theo :—"I mistake you not. I know you adore that which is locally and really *enclosed within the compass of your host and chalice, supposing it in matter and substance to be the glorious body of Christ;* but your foundation we say is false, and therefore your building must needs be ruinous. Christ is present in the mysteries, not by the material substance of His body *closed within the forms of bread and wine,* but *by a divine and spiritual virtue and efficience,* NOT MIXING HIS SUBSTANCE WITH THE ELEMENTS, BUT ENTERING THE HEARTS OF THE FAITHFUL, and nourishing them with His spirit and grace to eternal life, the elements abiding in their proper and former essence and substance." (Ibid, pp. 805, 6.)

XI.

"Neither they nor I ever denied the Eucharist to be a *sacrifice.* The very name enforceth it to be the sacrifice of *praise* and *thanksgiving;* which is the *true* and *lively* sacrifice of the New Testament. The Lord's table, in respect of His *graces* and *mercies* there proposed to us, is an heavenly banquet, which we must *eat,* and not sacrifice : but the *duties*

which He requireth at our hands, when we approach His table, are *sacrifices*, not *sacraments*. As namely, to *offer* Him *thanks* and *praises*, *faith* and *obedience*, yea our *bodies* and *souls*, to be living, holy, and acceptable *sacrifices* unto Him, which is our *reasonable* service." (Quoted from Waterland, Works, v., p. 134.)

Calfhill.

James Calfhill, or Calfield, born about 1530, educated at Oxford, was nominated to succeed Sandys as Bishop of Worcester, when Sandys was removed to London; but he died before his consecration.

The following extract is taken from Calfhill's answer to John Martial, who had dedicated to Queen Elizabeth a Romish work, entitled, "A Treatise of the Cross."

"But where I attribute to Christian ministry so much as I spake of, there is no cause of pride for popish priests. For they swerve so far from Christ's institution, that they serve not at all for any godly purpose. Christ did ordain His apostles to preach; and to that end He breathed on them, shewing, by that sign, the power and virtue of the Holy Ghost, wherewithal He endued them: but the Romish apes only retain the sign, the thing itself being farthest from them; and as for the end which Christ respected, they have least regard of. For they have taught their priests, that it is least part of their duty to preach; most to do sacrifice, and say Mass. . . . We know that Christ did offer Himself sufficiently; and made a perfect satisfaction for our sins. We know that He needeth not any priest's help to be as acceptable to His Father, for His service sake, as Christ for that one and only sacrifice of His body was.

Christ gave commandment to be faithful ministers, not bloody conjurors. Christ gave an injunction to feed the flock, not to offer sacrifice. Christ hath promised His Holy Ghost, not to purge and take away sins, but to maintain the church, and keep it in good order. And as for the argument, that the most learned papists do build upon the Greek word, may easily be answered. For Chrysostom, when he had considered how Paul had written, that he was a minister of Jesus Christ, consecrating the Gospel; (for so St. Augustine turneth it,) that there might be an acceptable oblation and sacrifice of the Gentiles, saith: that the apostle there did make full mention of all the sacrifice that he could make; using both the terms of λειτουργία and ἱερουργία, whereupon the papists will ground their idolatrous Mass. This is my sacrifice, to preach the Gospel, saith he: my sword is the Gospel; my sacrifice is the Gentiles." (Answer to Martiall, P. S. Edit., pp. 229, 230.)

Cooper.

Thomas Cooper, or Cowper, was made Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, 1540. In Mary's reign he practised as a physician in Oxford, but upon her death became a frequent preacher, and was several years Vice-chancellor of the University. In 1570 he was consecrated Bishop of Lincoln; and in 1584 was translated to Winchester. He died April 29th, 1594.

The following quotations are taken from a publication entitled, "An Answer in Defence of the Faith." It was written (1562) by Cooper in reply to an anonymous work, called "An Apology of Private Mass."

I.

"When we interpret Christ's words, we say it is a figurative speech, and such as the Holy Ghost often useth in the institution of sacraments and ceremonies, or in the describing of other mysteries. The figure is named Metonymia; when the name of the thing is given unto the sign. When these words therefore be laid unto us, 'This is My Body," we say it is most true. But mystically, *sacramentally*, figuratively, *not* REALLY and according to the natural substance. For this interpretation we have a number of examples out of the Canonical Scriptures." ("Defence of the Truth," P. S. Edit., p. 199.)

II.

"For, sure I am, that neither the institution of Christ maketh mention of any oblation or sacrifice to be done by the minister, saving only the sacrifice of thanksgiving: nor yet the Scripture appointeth any bounden duty for the priest more to use the sacrament than other godly and well-disposed Christian men. . . . . A sacrifice is a thing given to God: the sacrament was a thing given to us. Nothing therefore can be of nature more contrary than your sacrifice, and Christ's sacrament." (Ibid, pp. 87, 88.)

III.

"So much difference therefore as is between to give and to receive; to REMEMBER ONE *perfect sacrifice*, and daily to REITERATE a *sacrifice;* to celebrate in common as a testimony of unity, (and) to creep in corners or by-chapels as a sign of separation; so much difference is there between the *sacrament* by Christ's appointment, and the *sacrifice* of the Mass by you devised." (Ibid, p. 99.)

Coverdale.

Miles Coverdale, born 1487, studied at Cambridge, entered the Augustinian order, aided Tyndale in the translation of the Bible, and by permission of Henry VIII., published his own translation in 1535. It was the first printed English Bible. Three years after, while at Paris preparing for another edition, he was cited before the Inquisition, and the copies printed were condemned to be burnt. He returned to England, was made almoner to Queen Catharine Parr, and in 1551 Bishop of Exeter. In Queen Mary's reign he reached Geneva, contributing his aid to the Geneva Bible. He returned after Mary's death, and held for a short time a rectory in London. He died 1568.

The First extract is from a treatise, the plan of which was borrowed from Zuingle. It is said to have been first published at Marpurg in 1540—47.

I.

"But *then eat we His flesh,* and *then drink we His blood,* when we through *true belief* do ponder and consider what He hath done and suffered for our sakes; *then are we partakers of His Supper and Feast,* when we for His sake do live, as He did for His Father's sake." ("Fruitful Lessons," P. S. Edit., p. 212.)

II.

"But let us look, wherefore they call it a sacrifice. Even because, say they, that in the Mass Christ the Son is offered up unto God His Father. Oh, what a great blasphemy is this; yea, to be abhorred of all virtuous men! . . . . . But they will say, Christ is not so sacrificed in the Mass, that He dieth again upon the Cross; but it is for the remembrance of the same sacrifice that once was made. Why do they then call it a *sacrifice,* seeing it is but a *remembrance of a sacrifice?*" (Remains, pp. 470, 471.)

III.

"And when this perverse opinion was once received, it engendered many other superstitions. First, that carnal adoration, which is none other thing but mere idolatry. For if a man would prostrate himself before the bread, and honour Christ there, as if He were there present, contained therein, were not that the setting up of an idol instead of the sacrament? For we were not commanded to honour, but to eat."* ("Fruitful Lessons," p. 456.)

Fulke.

William Fulke born sometime before 1538. Educated at Cambridge, studied law for six years, was elected fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, 1564, was subsequently ejected on account of his intimacy with Cartwright. In 1571, he was presented to the rectory of Warley in Essex, and in 1573 to that of Dennington in Suffolk. Afterwards he accompanied the Earl of Lincoln as British Ambassador to Paris. In 1578 was made Master of Pembroke College. He died in 1589.

The first four extracts are taken from a work published in 1583, in defence "of the sincere and true translations of the Holy Scriptures into the English tongue."

I.

"The word *priest*, by Popish abuse, is commonly taken for a sacrificer, the same that *sacerdos* in Latin. But the Holy Ghost never calleth the ministers of the word and sacraments of the New Testament ἱερεῖς or *sacerdotes*. Therefore the translators, to make a difference between the ministers of the Old Testament and them of the New, calleth the one, according to the usual acception, priests, and

* This extract is from a treatise translated by Coverdale from Calvin.

the other, according to the original derivation, elders. Which distinction seeing the vulgar Latin text doth always rightly observe, it is in favour of your heretical sacrificing priesthood, that you corruptly translate *sarcerdos* and *presbyter* always, as though they were all one, *a priest*, as though the Holy Ghost had made that distinction in vain, or that there were no difference between the priesthood of the New Testament and the Old. The name of priest, according to the original derivation from *presbyter*, we do not refuse: but according to the common acception for a *sacrificer*, we cannot take it, when it is spoken of the ministry of the New Testament." ("Defence of Translation," P. S. Edit. p. 109.)

II.

"In denying the blasphemous sacrifice of the popish mass, with the altar and priesthood that thereto belongeth, we use no wily policy, but with open mouth at all times, and in all places, we cry out upon it. The sacrifices, priests, and altars of the Gentiles were abominable.

The sacrifices of the Jews, their priests, and altars, are all accomplished and finished in the only sacrifice of Christ, our High Priest, offered once for all upon the altar of the cross: which Christ our Saviour, seeing He is a High Priest according to the order of Melchisedec, hath an eternal priesthood, and such as passeth not by succession. (Heb vii.) Therefore *did* NOT Christ at His last supper institute *any* EXTERNAL *propitiatory sacrifice* of His body and blood, but a *sacrament*, joined with the *spiritual sacrifice* of praise

and thanksgiving: which sacrament being administered by the ministers thereto appointed, the sacrifice is so common to the whole Church of the faithful, who are all spiritual priests, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, as much as the minister of the word and sacraments." (Ibid, p. 241.)

III.

"Beza saith expressly in this place, (1 Cor. x.) that to bless here is to sanctify or consecrate, because that the ordinance of God being rehearsed and set forth, the bread and wine are appointed to this holy use, that they should be the *sacraments of* the true and natural body and blood of Christ, that is, the *signs and pledges thereof*, and that in such sort, that the same thing which is signified is *offered to us* to be *received spiritually*." (Ibid, pp. 501, 502.)

IV.

"Here is *no* SACRIFICE of *the body and blood of Christ*, but of *bread and wine for the mystery thereof;* no SACRIFICE *propitiatory for sins, but of thanksgiving*, and REMEMBRANCE *of the propitiation* made by the Lamb Himself, in hope of eternal redemption; no oblation by the priest only, but by the whole Church and every member thereof, as was the oblation of the Paschal Lamb, whereunto he compareth this sacrifice, interpreting those words of Exodus xii.: 'Every man shall take a lamb according to their families and households, and offer him in sacrifice at the evening.' That is to say, (saith Ceolfride,) all Christian Churches, etc., as before. By which words it is manifest, that the Papists

now-a-days are departed even from that faith of the sacrament and sacrifice thereof that Augustin brought from Rome." (Answers, P. S. Edit., p. 8.)

V.

"The Church of English Saxons believed the sacrament to be the body and blood of Christ, not carnally, but spiritually; expressly denying as well the CARNAL PRESENCE as *Transubstantiation*, which the Papists hold." (Ælf. Serm. Pasc. and Ep., Ibid, p. 20.)

VI.

"In the English Saxon Church the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not then hanged up to be worshipped, nor carried in procession, because they had not the opinion of CARNAL PRESENCE which the Papists have," etc. "The English Saxons' Church DENIED *that* WICKED *men received the body and blood of Christ.*" (Ælf. Serm. Pasc.) "The Papists hold that not only wicked men, but also brute beasts eat the body of Christ, if they eat the external *sacrament thereof.*" (Ibid, p. 21.)

VII.

"The calf that was killed was by God's appointment a sacrifice of the only and singular Sacrifice of Christ's death, and not by virtue of the signification; for the Jews had other ceremonies than sacrifices, which did signify the death of Christ: but the Lord's Supper is *not* by God's appointment a SACRIFICE; therefore the signification cannot make it so." (Ibid, p. 382.)

JEWEL.

Neal says of John Jewel, "He was born in Devonshire, 1522, and educated at Christ Church College, Oxon, where he proceeded M.A. 1544. In King Edward's reign he was a zealous promoter of the Reformation, but not having the courage of a martyr, he yielded to some things against his conscience in the reign of Queen Mary, for which he asked the pardon of God and the Church, among the exiles in Germany, where he continued a confessor of the Gospel till Queen Elizabeth's accession, when he returned home, and was preferred to the bishopric of Salisbury, in 1559. . . . . He was a truly pious man, and died in a comfortable frame of mind. Some of his last words were, 'I have not so lived that I am ashamed to die; neither am I afraid to die, for we have a gracious Lord. There is laid up for me a crown of righteousness. Christ is my righteousness. Lord, let thy servant depart in peace,' which he did at Mockton-Farley, September 25, 1571, in the fiftieth year of his age, and lies buried in the middle of the choir of the Cathedral of Salisbury." (History of the Puritans, i., p. 183.)

Jewel's powerful voice made itself so clearly heard, not in England only, but on the Continent;* he was so much regarded as the spokesman of the Reformed Church of England, the influence he exercised under Elizabeth was so great, moreover he has been so referred to in support of the arguments by which the "Real Objective Presence" has been defended, that we must occupy some space in extracts from his writings.

I.

"To conclude, Three things herein we must consider:—First, that we put a difference between the sign and the thing itself that is signified.

"Secondly, That we seek Christ above in heaven, and imagine *not Him to be present bodily upon the earth.*

* See Strype's Parker, Book iv., Chap. v., p. 317, and Strype's Annals, Vol. i., Chap. xxv., pp. 284—288. Also Heylin's History of Reformation, E. H. S. Edit., Vol. ii., p. 328—330, 385—387.

"Thirdly, *That the body of Christ is to be eaten by* FAITH ONLY, and NONE OTHERWISE." (Sermon and Harding, P.S. Edit., p. 449.)

II.

"Now consider thou, good Christian reader, with thyself, whether it be better to use this word '*figure*,' which word hath been often used of Tertullian, St. Augustine, and of all the rest of the ancient Fathers, without controlment; or else those new fangled words, 'really,' 'corporally,' 'carnally,' etc. Which words M. Harding is not able to show that, in this case of being REALLY IN the sacrament, any one of all the old Fathers ever used." (Ibid, p. 49.)

III.

"Cyrillus saith: Our sacrament teacheth us not to eat a man (with the material *mouth of our body*,) in ungodly sort leading the minds of the faithful unto gross cogitation. It is a holy mystery, and a heavenly action, forcing our minds up into heaven, and there teaching us to eat the body of Christ, and to drink His blood; not outwardly by the service of our bodies, but *inwardly* by *our* FAITH, and that verily and indeed. The truth hereof standeth not in any REAL *or* CORPORAL PRESENCE, but, as Hilarius saith, in a *mystery*, which is, in a *sacrament:* whereby outwardly and unto our senses we express that thing in our bodies that must be wrought inwardly in our minds.'" (Ibid, pp. 475, 476.)

IV.

"Like as the body or compass of the sun, being in one certain place of the heavens, reacheth out his beams and

giveth influence into the world; even so Christ, the Sun of Justice, being in heaven in one place at the right hand of God, likewise reacheth out His beams, and giveth His influence into the faithful, and so feedeth them, not by bare imagination of fantasy, but *truly*, *substantially*, and *indeed*. And as the sun is more comfortable, and more refresheth the world, being absent, by his beams, than if his very natural substance and compass lay here upon the earth; even so the body of Christ, being in the glory of the Father, in the very substance and nature of the flesh, and there evermore entreating mercy for our sins, is much more comfortable unto us, and more quickeneth both our bodies and souls by His heavenly and spiritual influence, than if it were here present fleshly before our eyes. And as the sun, not coming down from heaven, nor leaving his place, is nevertheless present with us in our houses, in our faces, in our hands, and in our bosoms; even so Christ, being in heaven, not coming down, nor leaving His room there, yet nevertheless is present with us in our congregations, in our hearts, in our prayers, in the mystery of baptism, and in the sacrament of His body and blood." (Ibid, p. 499.)

V.

"And where he saith, the sacraments of the New Testament contain covertly under them the thing itself that they signify, and that according to Christ's promise; verily this saying covertly containeth a great untruth. For as he is not able to allege any ancient learned Father that ever once mentioned this privy and secret being under such

covert, so he is not able to show that Christ ever made him any such promise touching the same." (Harding, Thess., etc., P.S. Edit., p. 602.)

VI.

"It appeareth by the witness of the ancient learned doctors and fathers, that we are really and corporally joined and united unto Christ, not only by the mysteries of the holy Supper, but also by faith, by baptism, by the Spirit of God, by love, and other ways." (Apology and Defence, P.S. Edit., p. 494.)

VII.

"St. Augustine saith: 'They washed their coats in the blood of the Lamb, that is to say, in the grace of God through Christ.' This grace flowing from Christ's body upon the cross, and given to the faithful in the ministration of the holy mysteries, oftentimes beareth the name of Christ's body, and is the ground and substance of the sacrament; and whosoever is partaker *of this grace is also partaker of Christ's body.* Therefore St. Augustine saith: 'Whereas the sacraments were common to all, yet the grace thereof was not common to all: and that is the power and strength of the sacraments.' . . . Here M. Harding once again moveth a very needless question. 'We demand,' saith he, 'whether we receive the same body of Christ by faith only, without our body, or with the office of our body.' Any child might soon be able to assoil this riddle. Rabanus Maurus saith, as it is alleged before; The *sacrament* is received with the *bodily* mouth; but with *the*

virtue of the sacrament (which is the *body of Christ*) the *inner man* (that is, not the body, but the soul) *is filled.*" (Ibid, p. 487.)

VIII.

"Now, as the body of Christ is seen, so is it touched; and, as it is touched, so is it eaten. But it is *not seen with bodily eyes;* it is not *touched with bodily fingers;* for St. Ambrose saith: 'By FAITH *Christ is touched;* by FAITH *Christ is seen.*' Therefore the body of Christ is NOT EATEN *with the bodily mouth,* but ONLY *by* FAITH, which is the *spiritual mouth of the* soul." (Ibid, p. 531.)

IX.

"Again he saith: 'Whoso abideth not in Christ, nor Christ in him, out of doubt he eateth not spiritually His flesh, nor drinketh His blood; notwithstanding carnally (that is to say with the bodily mouth) and visibly he do press with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; and rather eateth and drinketh (NOT CHRIST'S VERY BODY and BLOOD, *but*) the *sacrament* of so great a thing, unto his judgment.' These words, M. Harding, be so plain, that I cannot imagine what ye should more desire. They are guilty of the blood of Christ, for that they despise the price wherewith they were saved, not for that they receive it really into their mouths.

"So St. Augustine saith again: 'The advouterer is guilty of everlasting death, because he despised in himself the blood of our Saviour.' The distinction that you imagine between REAL *receiving* in the wicked, and EFFECTUAL *re-*

ceiving in the godly, as it is only of yourself, without the authority of any doctor, Greek or Latin, so is it nothing else but a very 'effectual' and 'real' folly. For the very body of Christ, *if it be* NOT EFFECTUALLY received, IS NOT *received.* Christ Himself saith: 'He that eateth me shall live by me.' St. Ambrose saith: 'This bread is the remission of sins. He that receiveth it shall not die the death of a sinner.'" (Defence and Letters, p. 895.)

X.

"You may not negligently pass over these words, M. Harding: St. Augustine saith plainly: 'The THING itself that is represented by the sacrament (that is to say, THE VERY BODY OF CHRIST) is *received* of ALL MEN TO LIFE, and of NO MAN TO DESTRUCTION, whosoever shall be partaker of it.' Hereof you must needs conclude against yourself, that the WICKED *receive* NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST." (Ibid, p. 895.)

XI.

"But M. Harding will reply, Chrysostom saith: 'As Christ was in the stall, so He is now upon the altar; and as He was sometimes in the woman's arms, so He is now in the priest's hands.' True it is Christ was there, and Christ is here; but not in one or like sort of being. For He was in the stall by BODILY PRESENCE; upon the holy table He is by *way of a* SACRAMENT. The woman in her arms held Him REALLY; the priest in his hands holdeth Him only *in a* MYSTERY. So saith St. Paul: 'Christ dwelleth in our hearts;' and no doubt the same Christ that lay in the stall. It is one and the same Christ; but the difference

standeth in the manner of His being there: for in the stall He lay by presence of His body; in our hearts He lieth by presence of faith. If this exposition seem to M. Harding over exquisite or curious, then will I say further: Christ is so upon the table as the faithful people is upon the table. St. Augustine, speaking to the people, saith thus: 'You are upon the table, you are in the cup.' But the people is not there grossly, really, and indeed, but in a mystery. Even so is Christ's body upon the table, not grossly, not REALLY, or *indeed*, but *in a* MYSTERY." (Ibid, p. 539.)

Hooker.

Richard Hooker, born 1554. Through the kindness of Bishop Jewel, he was sent to study at Oxford, where he became fellow of C.C.C. He was made master of the Temple in 1585, when he became involved in controversy with the Puritan Walter Travers. Four books of his "Ecclesiastical Polity" were published in 1594, a fifth in 1597, and the last three after his death. He died at Bishopsbourne in 1600.

The extracts following (all but the last) are taken from Hooker's great work "Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity," written to defend the Church of England against her assailants.

I.

"It followeth that nothing of Christ which is limited, that nothing created, that neither the soul nor the body of Christ, and consequently not *Christ as man* or Christ according to *His human nature can possibly* be everywhere present. . . . . That which excludeth Him therefore as man from so great largeness of presence, is only His being *man*, a creature *of this particular kind*, whereunto the God of nature hath set those bounds of restraint and limitation,

beyond which to attribute unto it anything more than a creature *of that sort* can admit, were to give it another nature. . . . . The substance of *the body of Christ* hath NO PRESENCE, neither *can have*, but *only* LOCAL. . . . There is no proof in the world strong enough to enforce that Christ had a TRUE *body* but by the *true* and *natural* properties of His body. Amongst which properties, DEFINITE or LOCAL *presence* is chief. . . . . If His *majestical* body have now any such *new* property, by force whereof it may everywhere even *in substance* present itself, or may at once be in many places, then hath the *majesty of His estate* extinguished the VERITY *of His nature.*" (Keble's Edit., vol. ii., pp. 240—242.)

II.

"His human substance in itself is naturally absent from the earth, His soul and body *not on earth* but in *heaven* ONLY. Yet because this substance is *inseparably joined* to that personal word which by His very divine essence is present with all things, the nature which cannot have in itself universal presence hath it *after a sort* by being *nowhere* severed from that which everywhere is present. . . . . Presence *by way of conjunction* is in some sort presence. . . . . His bodily substance hath everywhere a presence of true conjunction with Deity. . . . . As every number is infinite by possibility of addition, and every line by possibility of extension infinite, so there is no stint which can be set to the *value or merit of the sacrificed body of Christ;* it hath no measured certainty of limits, *bounds of efficacy* unto

life it knoweth none, but is also itself infinite in *possibility of application.*" (Ibid, pp. 242—245.)

III.

"As for any *mixture of the* SUBSTANCE OF HIS FLESH WITH OURS, the participation which we have of Christ includeth no *such* kind of *gross* surmise." (Ibid, p. 255.)

IV.

"The question is yet driven to a narrower issue, nor doth anything rest doubtful but this, whether when the sacrament is administered Christ be whole *within man only*, or else *His body and blood* be also *externally seated* in the very *consecrated elements* themselves; which opinion they that defend are driven either to *consubstantiate* and incorporate Christ with elements sacramental, or to *transubstantiate* and change their substance into His; and so the one to hold Him *really* but *invisibly* moulded up with the substance of those elements, the other to hide Him under the only visible show of bread and wine, the substance whereof as they imagine is abolished and His succeeded in the same room." (Ibid, pp. 349, 350.)

V.

"The REAL PRESENCE of Christ's most blessed body and blood is *not* therefore to be sought for *in the sacrament*, but in the *worthy receiver of the sacrament*.

And with this the very order of our Saviour's words agreeth: first 'Take and eat;' then, 'This is my body which

was broken for you:' first 'Drink ye all of this;' then followeth 'This is my blood of the new testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and where the bread is His body or the cup His blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them. As for the sacraments, they really exhibit, but for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not really nor do really contain in themselves that grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow." (Ibid, p. 352, 353.)

VI.

"Touching the ministry of the Gospel of Jesus Christ; the whole body of the Church being divided into laity and clergy, the clergy are either presbyters or deacons. I rather term the one sort *Presbyters* than *Priests*, because in a matter of so small moment I would not willingly offend their ears to whom the name of *Priesthood* is odious though without cause. . . . . Howbeit because the most eminent part both of heathenish and Jewish service did consist in sacrifice, when learned men declare what the word *Priest* doth *properly* signify *according to the mind of the first imposer* of that name, their ordinary scholies do well expound it to imply *sacrifice*. Seeing then that SACRIFICE *is now no part of the Church ministry* how should the name of *Priesthood* be thereunto rightly applied? Surely even as St. Paul applieth the name of flesh unto that very substance of fishes which hath a proportionable correspondence to flesh, although

it be in nature another thing. Whereupon when philosophers will speak warily, they make a difference between flesh in one sort of living creatures and that other substance in the rest which hath but a kind of analogy to flesh: the Apostle contrariwise having matter of greater importance whereof to speak nameth indifferently both flesh. The Fathers of the Church of Christ with like security of speech call usually the ministry of the Gospel *Priesthood* in regard of that which the Gospel hath *proportionable* to ancient *sacrifices*, namely the *Communion of the blessed Body and Blood of Christ*, although *it have properly now* NO SACRIFICE. As for the people when they hear the name it draweth no more *their minds* to any cogitation of sacrifice, than the name of a senator or of an alderman causeth them to think upon old age or to imagine that every one so termed must needs be ancient because years were respected in the first nomination of both.

"Wherefore to pass by the name, let them use what dialect they will, whether we call it a Priesthood, a Presbytership, or a Ministry it skilleth not: although in truth the word Presbyter doth seem more fit, and in propriety of speech more agreeable than *Priest* with the drift of the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ. For what are they that embrace the Gospel but sons of God? What are Churches but His families? Seeing therefore we receive the adoption and state of sons by their ministry whom God hath chosen out for that purpose, seeing also that when we are the sons of God, our continuance is still under their care which were our progenitors, what better title could there be given them

than the reverend name of Presbyters or fatherly guides? The Holy Ghost throughout the body of the New Testament making so much mention of them doth not anywhere call them Priests. The prophet Esay I grant doth; but in such sort as the ancient fathers, by way of analogy." (Ibid, pp. 469, 471, 472.)

Pilkington.

James Pilkington, born 1520. Educated at Cambridge; elected fellow of St. John's College, 1539. In 1550 he was appointed by Edward VI. to the vicarage of Kendal, in Westmoreland. In 1554, to avoid persecution, he left England, living at Zurich, Basil, and Geneva. On Elizabeth's accession he was appointed one of the commissioners for the revision of the Book of Common Prayer. In 1561 he was consecrated first Protestant Bishop of Durham. He died in 1575.

In 1561, Pilkington preached a sermon at St. Paul's Cross, on the destruction of St. Paul's Cathedral by lightning. This called forth an angry reply from a Papist, who attributed the calamity to God's judgment to "schismatical service," "pulling down altars," etc. In answer to this Pilkington wrote the work from which the following extracts are made.

I.

"The Church of God, according to the Scriptures, does profess and believe that all faithful Christians, worthily coming to the Lord's Table, receive *by* FAITH in those holy mysteries the *body and blood of Christ*, which was given, broken and shed for the sins of the whole world. This we teach, believe and follow, and exhort all men often to prepare themselves worthily thus to receive." (Works, P. S. Edit., p. 552.)

II.

"Wheresoever, therefore, the New Testament or Old writers use this word *altar*, they allude to that *sacrifice* of Christ, figured by Moses, and use the word still that Moses used to signify the *same sacrifice* withal; and rather it is a *figurative*, than a *proper* kind of speech in all such places. And because *altars* were ever used for *sacrifices*, to signify that *sacrifice* which was to come, seeing our Saviour Christ is come already, has fulfilled and *finished* all *sacrifices*, we think it best to take away all occasions of that Popish sacrificing mass (for maintaining whereof they have cruelly sacrificed many innocent souls) to minister on tables, according to these examples." (Ibid, p. 547.)

III.

"For their sacrifice of the mass, that he so much laments to be defaced, and all good consciences rejoice that God of His undeserved goodness has overthrown it, I refer all men to the fifth and last book that the blessed souls now living with God, Bishops Cranmer and Ridley, wrote of the sacrament, whose bodies they cruelly tormented therefore. There whosoever lust, may read, and with indifferency weigh the reasons of both parties, and judge with the truth. Stout Stephen would gladly have overthrown that book: but God confounded him, and their names live for ever. So long as that book stands unconfuted, they may bark against the truth, as the dog does against the moon, and not prevail." (Ibid, pp. 547, 548.)

Rogers.

Thomas Rogers, an eminent theologian, educated at Oxford, where he entered 1568. He was chaplain to Bancroft, Bishop of London. He died 1615.

The extracts are from his "Exposition of the Articles," published in 1586. A corrected edition was put forth in 1607, as "perused, and by the lawful authority of the Church of England allowed to be public," and which the Archbishop ordered all the parishes in his province to supply themselves with. (See Goode, Rule of Faith, vol. ii., p. 288.)

I.

"Which spiritual bread, that He might the better represent, He hath instituted earthly and visible bread and wine, for a sacrament of His body and blood. Whereby He doth testify, that as verily as we receive the bread with the hands, and chew the same with the teeth and tongue, to the nourishing of this life temporal, even so *by* FAITH (which is in place of *hands and mouth to the soul*) we *verily receive the* TRUE BODY and the TRUE BLOOD OF CHRIST our only Saviour, to the cherishing of the spiritual life in our souls." (On Art., P. S. Edit., p. 288.)

II.

"*The adversaries unto this truth.*"

". . . . . The Synusiasts, or Ubiquitaries, which think the body of Christ so is present in the Supper, as His said body, with bread and wine, by one and the same mouth, at one and the same time, of all and every communicant, is eaten corporally and received into the belly." (Ibid, p. 289.)

"Again, of others the same is unworthily received; that is to say, which themselves do not examine, nor judge, neither discern the Lord's body, and do communicate at the table of the Lord and at the table of devils. These may receive the sacrament, but not the true body of Christ." (Ibid, p. 292.)

III.

"*Error and adversaries unto this truth.*"

". . . . . The Ubiquitaries, *both Lutheran* and Popish; they saying the *very body of Christ*, at the Lord's Supper, *is eaten as well of the wicked as of the godly;* these affirming, that all communicants, bad and good, do eat the very and natural body of Christ Jesus." (Ibid, p. 293.)

IV.

"It is a fable that the mass is a sacrifice, and that propitiatory; . . . . a fable, that one and the same sacrifice is offered in the mass which was offered on the cross; a fable, that the said mass is any whit profitable for the quick, much less for the dead." (Ibid, p. 300.)

V.

"Dangerous deceits. For hereby men are to believe that . . . . Christ is *often offered;* contrary to the Scripture. . . . . The priest offereth up Christ; contrary to the Scripture. . . . . We are to *adore Christ* as always *present;* contrary to the Scripture, where we are taught to *remember Him absent.*" (Ibid, p. 301.)

Sandys.

Edwin Sandys, (or Sandes,) born 1519: was educated at Cambridge, and in 1547 was elected master of Catharine Hall. In Queen Mary's reign he was imprisoned with John Bradford, but by mediation of Sir Thomas Holcroft, was released. He escaped abroad, and remained for awhile at Strasbourg, whence, on his wife's death, he removed to Zurich, where he lived in the house of Peter Martyr. Returning to England, after Mary's death, he was consecrated Bishop of Worcester in 1559, together with Grindall (London), Cox (Ely), and Merick (Bangor). He was employed upon the Bishops' Bible. In 1570 he was made Bishop of London. And when Grindall, whom he had succeeded in London, was moved from York to Canterbury in 1576, Sandys took his place at York. He died in July, 1588.

The extracts are taken from sermons published in 1585.

I.

"In this sacrament there are two things, a visible sign, and an invisible grace: there is a visible sacramental sign of bread and wine, and there is the thing and matter signified, namely, the body and blood of Christ; there is an earthly matter, and an heavenly matter. The outward sacramental sign is common to all; as well the bad, as the good. Judas received the Lord's bread; but not that bread which is the Lord to the faithful receiver. The *spiritual part*, that which feedeth the soul, ONLY THE FAITHFUL *do receive*. For he cannot be partaker of the body of Christ, which is no member of Christ's body." (Sermons, P. S. Edit., p. 88.)

II.

...." Whom the heavens shall keep until the latter day. From *thence* and from no other *altar* shall he come, in his natural body, to judge both quick and dead. His natural

BODY is LOCAL, for *else it were not a natural body :* His *body* is THERE, therefore not HERE : for a natural *body* doth not occupy *sundry places at once.* Here we have a *sacrament,* a sign, a memorial, a commemoration, a representation, a figure effectual, of the body and blood of Christ." (Ibid, p. 88.)

III.

"By FAITH He is *seen,* by FAITH He is *touched,* by FAITH He is *digested.* Spiritually BY FAITH we *feed upon Christ, when we stedfastly believe that His body was broken, and His blood shed for us upon the cross ;* by which sacrifice, offered once for all, as sufficient for all, our sins were freely remitted, blotted out, and washed away. *This* is *our heavenly bread,* our *spiritual food.* This doth strengthen our souls and cheer our hearts. Sweeter it is unto us than honey, when we are certified by this outward sacrament of the inward grace given unto us through His death, when in Him we are assured of remission of sins and eternal life. Better food than this thy soul can never feed upon. This is the bread of everlasting life. *They which truly eat it shall live by it."* (Ibid, p. 89.)

IV.

"If a prince gave out his letters patent of a gift, so long as the seal is not put to, the gift is not fully ratified ; and the party to whom it is given thinketh not himself sufficiently assured of it. God's gift, without sealing, is sure ; as He Himself is all one, without changing: yet, to bear with our infirmity, and to make us more secure of His promise, to

His writing and word He added these outward signs and seals, to establish our faith, and to certify us that His promise is most certain. He giveth us therefore these holy and visible signs of bread and wine, and saith, 'Take and eat, this is my body and blood;' *giving unto the signs* the names which are *proper to the things signified* by them; as we used to do even in common speech, when the sign is a lively representation and image of the thing." (Ibid, pp. 303, 304.)

Willet.

Andrew Willet, born 1262. (His father had been sub-almoner to King Edward, and a sufferer during the persecutions in Queen Mary's reign.) Was Prebendary of Ely; he is said to have been usually called a living library, from the great extent of his reading and of his memory. He was very celebrated as a preacher, and for his work "Synopsis Papismi" dedicated to Queen Elizabeth. He died in 1621.

I.

"This then is our faith and judgment, that we are verily in this sacrament engrafted into the body of Christ, and do truly eat His flesh and drink His blood; but all this is done *spiritually* ONLY, and BY FAITH." (Quoted in Garbett's Voices of the Church of England, p. 48.)

II.

"*The Protestants.*—That wicked men and infidels CANNOT *in any sense* BE PARTAKERS of the true body and blood of Christ." (Ibid, p. 72.)

III.

"And in this sense we deny not, but that the sacrament may be called a sacrifice, that is, a spiritual oblation of

praise and thanksgiving; but that there is a proper and external sacrifice, as in the law of goats and bullocks, upon the cross of the body of Christ; so in the Eucharist, of the same body and flesh of Christ, we hold it for great blasphemy and heresy." (Ibid, p, 28.)

Here we close our review of passages selected from the writings of our English Reformers, for the purpose of instituting a comparison between their views on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and those of the maintainers of "the Real Objective Presence." No name has been designedly omitted. The list includes the High Churchmen of the period, as well as some who may be said to have had leanings towards the Puritans. And some special pains have been taken to give a true and faithful representation of the views of those who have quoted been as supporting the doctrine in question. No doubt there are expressions to be found, which, taken alone, might be regarded as not altogether inconsistent with such a doctrine. And from a catena of such passages we might possibly rise impressed with something like a suspicion that some of our Reformers held some modification of the Lutheran view. But of all such extracts it must be said that they are not testing passages; or rather, in them no real test has been applied to determine the manner of the presence taught. It is far otherwise with the extracts given above. They are purposely selected as testing passages. In them the views of each Reformer on this matter are brought out clearly and distinctly. Some in words repudiate "*the Real Presence*" altogether; and of the rest we may, I think, say that almost as with one mouth they repudiate those very views which are distinctive of the

(so-called) "Real Objective Presence." Here is no hesitating, doubtful language. To have studied these extracts carefully, is to feel that we are no longer floating on uncertainties, that we have touched the bottom, that we rest on sure ground, that we *know* what our Reformers *did* think and feel about the doctrine of the Corporal Presence in their own days, that we know too what they *would have* thought and felt and said about the doctrine of the (so-called) Real Objective Presence as it is taught in our days. Here is brought together concurrent, uniform, consentient testimony to the belief that Christ's body and blood are *not* present in the Eucharist after the manner taught by modern Ritualists; for we find our Reformers teaching us that the body and blood of Christ are—

(1) Not to be sought in the elements.
(2) Not received by the unfaithful (except in the sense of receiving the bare outward signs, which *are not*, though they *may be called* by the names of, the things signified).
(3) Not to be adored as present in or under the bread and wine.
(4) Not sacrificed or offered to God under the form of the bread and wine.

Our Reformers were, in fact, very jealous of allowing any such connexion of the *Sacramentum* and the *Res Sacramenti* as should seem either to give to the one, or in any way bind to the one, the honour due to the other.

Of the three things to be considered in the Eucharist—(1) The *Sacramentum*, or sign; (2) The *Res Sacramenti*, or thing signified; and (3) The *benefits* thereof—the Romish and real objective view made the two first inseparable, the third separable; but in the views of our Reformers the first is separable from the other two, but the second and third

are absolutely *inseparable:* that is, in other words, by the opponents of the Reformation it is taught that, by reason of the sacramental conjunction, the bread and wine cannot be received without the body and blood of Christ (the sign not without the thing signified), though *these* may be received without any of their benefits—to the condemnation of the unworthy receiver. By the Reformers, on the other hand, it was steadfastly maintained that there is no possibility of separating the reception of the body and blood of Christ from the reception of the benefits which we receive from them. Unworthy receivers may, in their view, receive the outward sign without receiving Christ at all. But there can be no receiving Christ's body and blood without receiving their saving efficacy. And this reception, in their teaching, can only be by faith. Their views on this matter may be said to be summed up in the words, "He that *eateth Me,* even he *shall live by Me.*"

Yet in this view of our Reformers there was (as we shall see hereafter) no reducing the Lord's Supper to bare signs. They regarded Christ as *really present,* and *really offering* Himself and all the benefits of His passion and sacrifice to the souls of the communicants. And the guilt of unbelief was, in their view, the guilt of *rejecting and refusing.* They accounted unbelievers to be guilty of the body and blood of Christ, not because they received THESE (the body and blood of Christ) *unworthily,* but because, without faith they *could not* and DID NOT RECEIVE THEM AT ALL.

It is indeed surprising how little hold the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist ever obtained in England. In the early part of Edward VI.'s reign things looked very different. There were great fears, and there was great cause for fear, that Lutherans would gain the ascendancy. Peter Martyr was in England, and M. Bucer and P. Fagius

were expected to strengthen his hands in opposing the views of the Reformed. Cranmer was yet supposed to be a firm supporter of "the Real Presence." So also were the Bishops who acted with him.

But in a little while these fears were allayed. Peter Martyr came boldly forward as a champion against the "Ubiquitarians." Cranmer publicly declared and most ably maintained his changed views. The other suspected Bishops were found ranging themselves on the same side. Bucer's resolute Protestantism, no doubt, made its influence felt; but the suggestions of his *modified Lutheranism* seem to have been *carefully eschewed.*

We need not wonder, therefore, that Traheron should be found writing to Bullinger (Dec. 1548): "The Archbishop of Canterbury, contrary to general expectation, most openly, firmly, and learnedly maintained your opinion on this subject. I perceive that it is all over with Lutheranism, now that those who were considered its principal and almost only supporters have altogether come over to our side." (Original Letters, P. S. Edit., i., p. 323.) Nor that Ridley should speak, both in his writings and in his Conference with Bourne after being committed to the Tower, as if in England ALL learned men were AGREED in opposition to the views of Melancthon and the Lutherans.

Those whose views incline towards the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist are in the habit of lamenting the influence which our English refugees brought with them, on the accession of Elizabeth, from the Continent. They regard them as having acquired an unhappy tendency from their intercourse with and affection towards foreign divines. But, in truth, it may well be questioned whether the religious tendencies of our Reformers (in the matter, at least, of Eucharistic doctrine) were not much rather the cause than

the effect of this friendship. There were Lutheran theologians on the Continent as well as those of the opposite school. Why did our Reformers associate almost only with the latter? Why did they not become equally influenced by men of strong Lutheran tendencies? The answer is surely not far to seek. It is contained in this simple fact, that the Lutherans had no welcome for our English exiles. Why was it that our English divines found so warm a welcome among the Reformed, and no such reception among Lutherans? Simply because they were known to have taken their sides before. In a word, they went out with warm sympathies—sympathies which had already created friendships—towards the one, and with views decidedly opposed to the other.

Again, on the accession of Elizabeth (when, doubtless, the Lutheran party, strengthened in Mary's reign, had become considerable), overtures proceeded from the English Court, with the idea of joining the great Lutheran (or Schmalkaldic) league; and negotiations on the subject of this union were continued eagerly for a while. Here was fresh cause for alarm to the Reformed party. And Bullinger wrote: "I see no small disturbances like to arise in England also, if the Augustan Confession be received, which some would have; a thing very unworthy in many regards. . . . . Beware, and lay to your helping hand, that it be not received. *King Edward's reformation satisfieth the godly.*" (See Strype's Annals, chap. ii., p. 53, and Zurich Letters, ii., 17.) The Augustan Confession (*i.e.* the Confession of Augsburg) was *not* received. The negotiations were broken off. And Grindal wrote to Zanchius: "When first her highness Elizabeth, under most auspices, began her reign, the Popish doctrine and worship being cast off, she restored all things to *that standard* of the administration of the Word of God,

and the sacraments, and whole of religion, which had been drawn up and established during the reign of Edward VI. of happy, but also of lamented memory." (Remains, pp. 338, 339.)

The Reformed party regained a full and complete ascendancy. And we find Jewel writing to Peter Martyr (Nov. 1560; Zurich Letters, i., pp. 92, 93): "Our Church, by the blessing of God, is at length in peace. . . . . That volatile Ubiquitarian doctrine cannot by any means gain footing among us." And again he writes to the same (in Feb. 1562; Zurich Letters, i., p. 100): "As to your statement that a kind of *interim* and farrago of religion is aimed at by some parties, may God prevent it! . . . . . As to matters of *doctrine*, we have pared away *everything* to the *very quick*, and do *not differ* from *your doctrine by a nail's breadth;* for as to the Ubiquitarian theory, there is NO *danger in* THIS COUNTRY."

To the same effect Bishop Horn writes to Bullinger (in 1563; Zurich Letters, i., p. 135): "We have throughout England the *same ecclesiastical doctrine* as yourselves." And again (Ibid): "Of the books you mention in your second letter, I have received three upon the same arguments, against the Ubiquitarianism of Brentius, which subject a certain Englishman has undertaken as you desire . . . . that it may be manifest to every one, that the people of England entertain on these points *the same opinions* as you do at Zurich." To the same effect Bishop Parkhurst writes to Josiah Simler (Feb. 1574; Zurich Letters, i., p. 302): "So far are we English from defending either the Ubiquitarian or any other monstrous opinions, that *we cannot endure them.* We *only dispute* about *ceremonies and habits*, and things of *no importance*." And to the same effect also Bishop Grindal writes to Bullinger (Aug. 27, 1566; Zurich

Letters, i., p. 169): "The pure doctrine of the Gospel remained in all its integrity and freedom; in which, even to this day, (notwithstanding the attempts of many to the contrary,) we MOST FULLY agree *with your Churches, and with the confession you have lately set forth.*"

No. IV.

BOOKS OF SANCTION.

We are now about to pass from the opinions of individual Reformers, to writings which may be regarded as having had given them more or less of the character of sanctioned or authoritative books and documents of the English Reformed Church.

This seems, therefore, to be the proper place for giving a reason, for what may be regarded as a strange and unnatural (perhaps even an unfair) course of proceeding—the fixing our attention *first* on the views of individuals, and ascending step by step, till we reach at *last* the writings of the highest symbolical authority in our Church.

No doubt the opposite course, would have been, in many ways, preferable. Yet, there *is* a reason for not adopting it; and a reason, which, when stated, will, I hope, remove all impression of unfairness, and will commend itself to the minds of those who are really desirous of seeing their way clear to forming a fair judgment, and giving a true verdict on the question before us.

I am not wishing to impute anything to the motives of those who differ from me, when I say, that it seems to me to make a very important difference in the view of our

Formularies, whether we approach them through the language of modern writers on this subject, or through the language of the Reformers, under whose auspices they were compiled or reformed.

And, this being so, I must be allowed to regard it, as, not only *not unfair*, but only *fair* and *right* that we should draw near to examine them through the language of that Theology, to which they may be said to belong.

But here let me not be misunderstood. I would not ask my readers to gather from my Extracts the views of our Reformers, and then take these views with them that they may put them into, and fasten them on to, our Liturgy and Articles. Against such a proceeding, I desire most earnestly to caution every one. It does not follow, that the views (however distinct and definite) of individuals (however numerous and influential) should have been of necessity, stamped definitely on the authoritative expositions of our Church's teaching. It would be *most unfair*, to assume that all the opinions of our Reformers must be clearly stamped on our Prayer Book. It would be most unjustifiable to import all the opinions of our Reformers into statements on the same subjects in our Articles.

Of course my readers cannot but form their own opinions of the *probability* or *possibility* of our Reformers, with such distinctly expressed opinions, authorizing formularies which should speak either a contrary, or a different, or a doubtful language, on such a subject as that before us.

But the testimony of our formularies is a testimony which is to speak for itself. Their own voice is to be heard. What they say *for themselves* is what we are concerned with. We may not seek to make our symbolical books *mean* more than they *say*, because we may have learnt to know that

such an added meaning would only be in accord with the expressed opinions of our Reformers.

It is not for this that I have adopted the course I am defending. It will not, I hope, lead to this, that my previous papers have been filled with Extracts from our Reforming Divines.

My desire is not to sanction senses *imported into* our Formularies but to protect our Formularies from having their true natural meaning cast away, or exchanged for something new and not their own.

Our Articles have a meaning, and that meaning, I conceive, we are bound sacredly to guard. We may not make them mean more than they say. We must not allow them to mean less than in the right interpretation of their language, they clearly *do* say. We must keep watch against the error which would *force* a sense *into* them. But we are bound also to guard them from any force which would rob them of that which in fairness and truth belongs to them.

To aim at such a defence of their sense is, I am persuaded, to aim at doing that which is true and just in our dealings with our Formularies, and with our Reformers from whom we inherit them.

And it is with a view to this, and only this, that I have chosen to approach from lower ground upwards to the Articles of our Church.

If distance of time has made in the language of our Formularies anything which *was clear* to be now at all *doubtful* or anyways *indistinct*, then to look at our Formularies through the language of the Reformation as through a glass, is to use the language of our Reformers only as men use a telescope to remove the obscurities of distance, that they may see things only in their true form and colour,

that those things may appear to them as without a glass they would appear if they were nearer. It is not at all to do as *they* do, who would look at objects through such a glass as will colour or distort whatever is seen through it. I only claim for the sense of our Formularies that it should not be regarded as variable, and shifting, like a quicksand, by the force of the tides and currents and under currents of rising or falling theolgical systems.

I only claim for them, that what they clearly and distinctly meant at the time of their settlement, they ought clearly and distinctly to mean *now*—that what doctrines they were felt plainly to exclude *then*, they ought to be seen plainly to exclude *now*—that what opinions they certainly *had* stamped with an unmistakeable character *then*, they ought to be regarded as having those same opinions firmly impressed on them still.

I mean that our Formularies may not be regarded as things to be tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of human opinion, but must be understood as having some sense, definite and determined; and that that sense we are called upon to uphold unchanged, and to defend at all costs.

And, if this be so indeed, then I contend, that if, and so far as, theological language may have varied in the course of three centuries; if, and so far as, expressions once plain, may have become ambiguous; if, and so far as, language which was exclusive then, may be thought to be inclusive now; if, and so far as, words which may have spoken distinctly the language of one side of the controversy then, may be thought capable of a different meaning now;—it is no more untrue, or unjust, or unfair, to read these in the light of the theological language of the time, than it would be if they had been written in a language now dead, to translate

them into our vernacular, or if they contained words now altogether changed in their meanings, to look into an old English dictionary for the true sense they should bear.

Ridley used the word *worship* in a sense we should none of us think of giving to it now. We are not to make Ridley talk nonsense, by forcing the modern meaning of the word into his sayings. And as little, I contend, may we take any modern senses or explanations, or glosses, to mould into shape, to add to or to deduct from, whatsoever may have been originally distinct and clear and obvious in the sense of our Formularies, as they would have been naturally understood in the theological language of their time.

Such then, is the use—the only use—I wish to make of the writings of our Reformers* as we approach the inspection of our authorized Formularies, with reference to the question, "Do they or do they not teach the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence?"

But it must not, of course, be supposed that because I disclaim any further use of our Reformers' writings for this purpose, therefore I am prepared to lay down, or mean to put aside, the positive bearing on the question before us, of the cumulative evidence afforded by the unvarying testimony of all our Reformers. If it be so, that our Reformers have, as with one voice, rejected and repudiated the doctrine in question, what *shall* we, (as many of us as have learnt to thank God for the Reformation of the English Church,) what *can* we, think of a system which would teach us to cast overboard our Reformers and the doctrines they held so sacred and precious, and left us to hold sacred and precious too; which would teach us that in those doctrines is a denial

* That is, for purposes of interpretation. They will be brought forward also as historical evidence, for the purpose of removing objections to the natural meaning of some of our Formularies.

of what we ought to hold—not as an opinion only, but as *de fide*, which would then bid us put the helm to, that we might steer our ship back again to the very harbour from which our Reformers set sail, as from a plague-infected land, and this, that we may take on board again the very wares and merchandise, the very same poisonous doctrines of which our Reformers lightened our ship, some of them at the cost of their lives?

There are, indeed, those who professedly regard our Reformers and the Reformation with feelings of deep repugnance.

The position of such, as ministers of the Reformed Church of England, is one which may safely be left to set itself to rights.

We have nothing to do in these papers with strong language, and indignant declamation; and I believe it needs nothing but the good common sense of Englishmen to make it felt that, with whatever good intention it may be attempted, such a position is too anomalous to be permanently maintained.

We desire, I trust from our hearts, for such persons nothing worse than that they may learn to prize the Reformation as a blessed work of God, however frail and sinful may have been some of the instruments employed.

We have for our opponents not these—but those who (agreeing in doctrine with them) yet believe and maintain that they are teaching the doctrines taught by our Church, and sanctioned by our Reformation, and upheld by at least one class—the better class—of our Reformers; and our object is to show that as to the doctrines of the Real Objective Presence, it was utterly *repudiated* by *our Reformers*, and is *excluded* by the teaching of our Formularies as fairly and truly interpreted. Its repudiation by

our Reformers has, I believe, been shewn by their own witness, as alleged in previous papers. Its exclusion by our Formularies, understood in their plain, obvious, natural sense, with a fair light fairly thrown upon them by the theological language of the Reformation, will I trust be shewn in future papers. Meanwhile we have first to review certain works which may be said either (at certain times) to have received some sanction, or something like sanction, or to be of some lesser authority, or quasi-authority, in the English Church, that after their measure they may add somewhat to the weight of testimony which bears witness to the rejection of the doctrine before us.

I.

The Catechism of Edward VI., A.D. 1553.

The Catechism of Edward VI. was authoritatively set forth for the use of all schoolmasters throughout England, by letters patent and injunction of His Majesty King Edward VI., bearing date May 1553. It is generally attributed to Dr. Ponet (or Poynet,) Bishop of Winchester, and was duly examined and approved by certain bishops, and other learned men, among whom were Cranmer, Ridley and others. It is especially worthy of notice as having been, in the words of Bishop Randolph, "the last work of the Reformers in that reign: whence it may fairly be understood to contain, as far as it goes, their ultimate decision; and to represent the sense of the Church of England as then established." Under Queen Mary it was suppressed and burnt, and was "the Catechismus Reprobatus" of her first Convocation. Copies of it are now very rare.

Archbishop Wake, says, "in this the complete model of our Church Catechism was laid." The title is "A Short Catechism; or, Plain Instruction, containing the Sum of Christian Learning, set forth by the King's Majesty's authority, for all schoolmasters to teach." The Latin and English versions are given in the vol. of the Parker Society containing the Liturgies of Edward VI.

The following quotations are taken from an edition published by Whittaker in 1857 :—

I.

"Christ is not so altogether absent from the world, as many do suppose. For albeit the *substance of His body* be *taken up from us :* yet is His Godhead perpetually present with us.... Spiritual things are not to be seen, but with the eye of the Spirit. Therefore, he that in earth will see the Godhead of Christ, let him open the eyes, not of His body, but of His mind, but of His faith ; and he shall see Him present, whom eye hath not seen; he shall see Him present, and in the midst of them, wheresoever be two or three gathered together in His Name, he shall see Him present with us, even unto the end of the world. What said I? Shall he see Christ present? Yea, he shall both see and feel Him dwelling within himself, in such sort as he doth his own proper soul.... Although He be already gone up into heaven; nevertheless by His nature of Godhead, and by His Spirit, He shall always be present in His Church, even to the end of the world. Yet this *proveth not that He is* PRESENT *among us in* HIS BODY. For His Godhead hath *one property :* His manhood *another.* His manhood was

create, His Godhead uncreate. His manhood is in *some* ONE *place of heaven:* His Godhead is in such sort eachwhere, that it filleth both heaven and earth. But to make this matter plainer, by a similitude or comparing of like to like: There is nothing that doth trulier, like a shadow, express Christ, than the sun; for it is a fit image of the light and brightness of Christ. The sun doth alway keep the heaven: yet do we say that it is present also in the world; for without light there is nothing present, that is say, nothing to be seen of any man: for the sun with his light fulfilleth all things. So Christ is lifted up above all heavens, that He may be present with all, and fully furnish all things, as St. Paul doth say. But as touching the *bodily* presence of Christ here in earth (if it be lawful to place in comparison great things with small,) Christ's body is *present* to our *faith*; as the sun, when it is seen is present to the eye: the body whereof, although it do not bodily touch the eye, nor be presently with it together here in earth, yet is it present to the sight, notwithstanding so large a distance of space between. So Christ's body, which at His glorious going up was conveyed from us; which left the world, and is gone unto His Father: *is a great way* ABSENT FROM OUR MOUTH, *even then when we* RECEIVE WITH OUR MOUTH *the holy sacrament of His body and blood.* Yet is our faith in heaven, and beholdeth the Sun of Righteousness; and is presently together with Him in heaven, in such sort as the sight is in heaven with the body of the sun, or in earth the sun with the sight. And

as the sun is present to all things by his light: so is Christ also in His Godhead. Yet neither can from the body the light of the sun be sundered; nor from His immortal body the Godhead of Christ. We must therefore so say, that Christ's body is in some one place of heaven, and His Godhead everywhere: that we neither of His Godhead *make a body:* nor of *His body* a God. . . . He could not be presently with all at once, unless His body were so turned into Godhead, that He might be in *all* or in *many places* together: as Eutyches, and certain like heretics held opinion. If it so were that He might be eachwhere present with all, at one very instant time: then were He NOT MAN, but a *ghost*: neither should He have a TRUE *body*, but a *fantastical:* whereof should have sprung forth a thousand errors, all which He hath dispatched by carrying His body up whole to heaven." (Whittaker's Edition, pp. 16—20.)

II.

"*Master:*—What declareth and betokeneth the supper unto us, which we solemnly use in the remembrance of the Lord?"

"*Scholar:*—The supper (as I have showed a little before) is a certain thankful remembrance of the death of Christ: forasmuch as the bread representeth His body, betrayed to be crucified for us, the wine standeth in stead and place of His blood, plenteously shed for us. And even as by bread and wine our natural bodies are sustained and nourished, so by the body, that is, the flesh and blood of

Christ, the soul is fed through faith, and quickened to the heavenly and godly life."

"*Master* :—How come these things to pass ?"

"*Scholar* :—*These things come to pass by a certain secret mean and lively working of the Spirit, when we believe that Christ hath, once for all, given up His body and blood for us,* to make a sacrifice and most pleasant offering to His heavenly Father; and also when we confess and acknowledge Him our only Saviour, High Bishop, Mediator and Redeemer; to whom is due all honour and glory."

"*Master* :—All this thou dost well understand. For methinketh thy meaning is: that *faith is the mouth of the soul, whereby we receive this heavenly meat,* full both of salvation and immortality, dealt among us by the means of the Holy Ghost." (Whittaker's Edition pp. 32—33.)

II.

Nowell's Catechism.

Alexander Nowell was born about 1507. He was educated at Brasen-Nose College, Oxford, of which in 1595 he was made president.

In Queen Mary's reign he was at first among the exiles at Strasburgh, and afterwards at Frankfort.

Returning to England on the accession of Elizabeth, he became Dean of St. Paul's, and was chosen to be Prolocutor in the Convocation which revised the "Articles of Religion." He died in 1602.

Dr. Blakeney says:

"In 1553, a Catechism known as Ponet's, was sanctioned by Convocation. In 1561 it was determined to improve upon it, and Dean Nowell was employed for the purpose.

"His work, commonly called 'Nowell's Catechism' was approved by Convocation in 1562, 'But,' says Procter, 'not formally sanctioned, apparently because it was treated as part of a larger design which was not realized,'—that design being to publish in one book the Articles, Nowell's Catechism, and Jewel's Apology, with public approval." (Blakeney on Book of Common Prayer, p. 568.)

There is no question that reference is made to this Catechism on the 79th canon, which says:—

"All schoolmasters shall teach in English or Latin, as the children are able to bear, the larger or shorter Catechism heretofore by public authority set forth."

The following Extracts are taken from the English Translation of Norton as given in the Parker Society's Edition.

I.

"*Master:*—Tell me how this is to be understood."

"*Scholar:*—Plainly, that Christ in His body ascended into heaven, where He had not afore been in His body, and *left the earth*, where He had afore been *in His body*. For in His nature of Godhead, which filleth all things, both He ever was in heaven and also with the same, and with His Spirit, He is alway present in earth with His Church, and shall be present to the end of the world."

"*Master :*—Then thou sayest, that there is one manner of His Godhead and another of His manhood."

"*Scholar :*—Yea, forsooth, master. For we neither make of His Godhead a body, nor of His body God; for *His manhood is a creature*, His Godhead not created. And the Holy Scriptures witness that His *manhood* was *taken up into heaven* and abideth in heaven; but His Godhead is so everywhere that it filleth both heaven and earth."

"*Master :*—But dost thou say that Christ is in any wise present with us in body?"

"*Scholar :*—If we may liken great things to small, Christ's body is so present to our faith, as the sun when we see it, is present to our eye. For no one thing subject to our senses, cometh more near to the likeness of Christ than the sun, which, though it still abide in the heaven, and therefore in very deed toucheth not the eye, yet the body of the sun is present to the sight, notwithstanding so great a distance of place between. So the body of Christ, which by His ascending is taken up from us, and hath left the world, and hath gone to His Father, is indeed absent from our senses, yet our faith is conversant in heaven, and beholdeth that Sun of Righteousness, and is verily in presence with it there present, like as our sight is present with the body of the sun in the heaven, or as the sun is present with our sight in earth. Moreover, as the sun is with his light present to all things, so is also Christ, with His Godhead, Spirit and Power, present to all, and filleth all." (Pages 162, 163.)

II.

"*Master :*—Thou conceivest well the right understanding concerning the visible signs and outward use of the sacraments. But whereas, secondly, thou givest to the sacraments the strength and efficacy to seal and confirm God's promises in our hearts, thou seemest to assign to them the proper offices of the Holy Ghost."

"*Scholar :*—To lighten and give bright clearness to men's minds and souls, and to make their consciences quiet and in security, as they be indeed, so ought they to be accounted the proper work of the Holy Ghost alone, and to be imputed to Him, and this praise not to be transferred to any other. But this is no impediment, but that God may give to His mysteries the second place in quieting and establishing our minds and consciences, but yet so that nothing be abated from the virtue of His Spirit. Wherefore we must determine that, the *outward element hath* neither OF ITSELF NOR IN ITSELF inclosed the force and efficacy of the sacrament, but that the same wholly floweth from the Spirit of God, as out of a spring-head, and is by the divine mysteries, which are ordained by the Lord for this end, conveyed unto us." (Ibid, p. 206, 207.)

III.

"*Master :*—Sith we be in the earth, and Christ's body in heaven, how can that be that thou sayest?"

"*Scholar :*—We must lift our souls and hearts from earth, and raise them up by faith to heaven, where Christ is."

"*Master* :—Sayest thou then the mean to receive the body and blood of Christ standeth upon faith ?"

"*Scholar* :—Yea. For *when we believe that Christ died to deliver us from death, and that He rose again to procure us life, we are partakers of the redemption purchased by His death,* and of His life, and all other His good things ; and with the same conjoining wherewith the head and the members are knit together, He coupleth us to Himself by secret and marvellous virtue of His Spirit, even so that we be members of His body, and be of His flesh and His bones, and do grow into one body with Him."

"*Master* :—Dost thou then, that this conjoining may be made, imagine the bread and wine to be changed into the substance of the flesh and blood of Christ?"

"*Scholar* :—There is no need to invent any such change. For both the Holy Scriptures, and the best and most ancient expositors, do teach that by baptism we are likewise the members of Christ, and are of His flesh and bones, and do grow into one body with Him, when yet there is no such change made in the water."

"*Master* :—Go on."

"*Scholar* :—In both the sacraments the substances of the outward things are not changed ; but the word of God and heavenly grace coming to them, there is such efficacy, that as by baptism we are once regenerate in Christ, and are first, as it were, joined and grafted into His body ; so when we rightly receive the Lord's Supper, with the very divine nourishment of His body and blood, most full

of health and immortality, given to us by the work of the Holy Ghost, and received of us *by faith, as the mouth of our soul,* we are continually fed and sustained to eternal life, growing together in them both into one body with Christ."

"*Master :*—Then Christ doth also otherwise than by His Supper only give Himself unto us, and knitteth us to Himself with most strait conjoining."

"*Scholar :*—Christ did then principally give Himself to us to be the author of our salvation, when He gave Himself to death for us, that we should not perish with deserved death. By the Gospel also He giveth Himself to the faithful, and plainly teacheth that He is that lively bread that came down from heaven to nourish their souls that believe in Him. And also in baptism, as is before said, Christ gave Himself to us effectually, for that He then made us Christians."

"*Master :*—And sayest thou that there are no less strait bands of conjoining in the Supper ?"

"*Scholar :*—In the Lord's Supper both that communicating which I spake of is confirmed unto us, and is also increased, for that each man is both by the words and mysteries of God, ascertained that the same belongeth to Himself, and that Christ is by a certain peculiar manner given to Him, that He may most fully and with most near conjunction enjoy Him, insomuch that not only our souls are nourished with His holy body and blood as with their proper food, but also our bodies, for that they partake of the sacraments of eternal life, have, as it were by a pledge given them, a

certain hope assured them of resurrection and immortality, that at length Christ abiding in us and we again abiding in Christ, we also, by Christ abiding in us, may obtain not only everlasting life, but also the glory which His Father gave Him. In a sum I say thus: as I imagine not any gross joining, so I affirm that same secret and marvellous communicating of Christ's body in His Supper to be most near and strait, most assured, most true, and altogether most high and perfect."

"*Master:*—Of this that thou hast said of the Lord's Supper, meseems, I may gather that the same was not ordained to this end, that Christ's body should be offered in sacrifice to God the Father for sins."

"*Scholar:*—*It is* NOT *so offered.* For He, when He did institute His Supper, commanded us to *eat* His body, not to *offer* it. As for the prerogative of offering for sins, it pertaineth to Christ alone, as to Him which is the eternal Priest; which also when He died upon the cross, once made that only and everlasting sacrifice for our salvation, and fully performed the same for ever. For us there is nothing left to do, but to take the use and benefit of that eternal sacrifice bequeathed us by the Lord Himself, which we chiefly do in the Lord's Supper."

"*Master:*—Then I perceive the holy Supper sendeth us to the death of Christ, and to His sacrifice once done upon the cross, by which alone God is appeased toward us."

"*Scholar:*—It is most true. For by bread and wine the signs is assured unto us, that as the body of Christ was

once offered a sacrifice for us to reconcile us to favour with God, and His blood once shed, to wash away the spots of our sins, so now also in His Holy Supper *both are given to the faithful*, that we surely know that the reconciliation of favour pertaineth to us, and may take and receive the fruit of the redemption purchased by His death."

"*Master* :—Are then the only faithful fed with Christ's body and blood?"

"*Scholar* :—THEY ONLY. For to whom He communicateth His body, to them, as I said He communicateth also everlasting life."

"*Master* :—Why dost thou not grant that the body and blood of Christ *are included in the bread and cup*, or that the bread and wine are changed into the substance of His body and blood?"

"*Scholar* :—Because that were to bring in *doubt the* TRUTH *of Christ's body*; to do dishonour to Christ Himself; and to fill them with abhorring that receive the sacrament, if we should imagine His body either to be enclosed in so narrow a room, or to be *in many places at once*, or His flesh to be chewed in our mouth with our teeth, and to be bitten small and eaten as other meat." (Page 213—216.)

III.

JEWEL'S APOLOGY.

Bishop Jewel's Apology is recognized in Canon 30 of the Canons of 1603, as "the Apology of the Church of England," and is quoted by Hooker (Eccl. Pol. ii. 6.) under the name of "The English Apology." Collier states, that it

was approved by the Queen, and set forth with the consent of the bishops. (Eccl. Hist. ii. 479.) And Bishop Jewel himself, in his reply to Harding, says, that he had the concurrence of the whole English clergy, and that the book had the Queen's licence. It was first published in 1562, the very same year as our present Articles; and "by Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles, and four successive archbishops, the Apology was ordered to be read and chained up in all parish churches throughout England and Wales" (Watt under the name "Jewel.") And of this work and Nowell's Catechism, Bishop Randolph thus speaks in the Preface to his Enchiridion. "My choice has been principally directed to such works as had the sanction of public authority, and which may, therefore, be relied on as containing the final and decided opinions of our Reformers, approved of in the general by the Church at large. . . . . Of this kind, that is, thus publicly received, were Jewel's Apology and Nowell's Catechism, the former of which is said to have been published with the consent of the bishops, and was always understood to speak the sense of the whole Church, in whose name it is written; the latter had the express sanction of Convocation. . . . . Both these works were publicly received and allowed."

The following Extracts are taken from Lady Bacon's Translation, as given in the Parker Society's Edition :—

I.

"And, although the Majesty and Godhead of Christ be everywhere abundantly dispersed, yet we believe that *his* BODY as St. Augustine saith, 'must needs be still in ONE PLACE;' and that Christ hath given majesty unto His body, but yet hath not taken away from it the NATURE *of a body*, and what we must not so affirm Christ to be God, that we

deny Him to be man; and as the martyr Vigilius saith, that 'Christ hath LEFT *us* as touching His *human nature*, but hath NOT LEFT us as touching His *divine nature*,' and that the same Christ, though He be ABSENT from us concerning His MANHOOD, yet is ever present with us concerning His Godhead." (Page 59.)

II.

"And those sacraments, together with Tertullian, Origen, Ambrose, Augustine, Hierome, Chrysostom, Basil, Dionysius, and other Catholic fathers, do we call figures, signs, marks or badges, prints, copies, forms, seals, signets, similitudes, patterns, representations, remembrances, and memories. And we make no doubt, together with the same doctors, to say, that those be certain visible words, seals of righteousness, tokens of grace; and do expressly pronounce that in the Lord's Supper there is truly given unto the *believing* the body and blood of the Lord, the flesh of the Son of God, which quickeneth our souls, the meat that cometh from above, the food of immortality, grace, truth, and life; and the supper to be the communion of the body and blood of Christ; by the partaking whereof we be revived, we be strengthened, and be fed unto immortality; and whereby we are joined, united, and incorporate unto Christ, that we may abide in Him, and He in us. . . . . We say that Eucharistia, the Supper of the Lord, is a *sacrament*, that is to wit, *an evident token* of the body and blood of Christ, wherein is set, as it were, before our eyes, the death

of Christ, and His resurrection, and what act soever He did whilst He was in His mortal body; to the end we may give Him thanks for His death, and for our deliverance; and that, by the often receiving of this sacrament, we may daily renew the remembrance of that matter, to the intent we being fed with the body and blood of Christ, may be brought into the hope of the resurrection and everlasting life, and may most assuredly believe that the body and blood of Christ doth in like manner feed our souls, as bread and wine doth feed our bodies. To this banquet we think the people of God ought to be earnestly bidden, that they may all communicate among themselves, and openly declare and testify both the godly society which is among them, and also the hope which they have in Christ Jesus." (Page 62, 63.)

III.

"We affirm that bread and wine are holy and heavenly mysteries of the body and blood of Christ, and that by them Christ Himself, being the true bread of eternal life, is so presently given unto us, as that *by faith* we verily receive His body and His blood. . . . . For we affirm that Christ doth truly and presently give His own self, in His sacraments, in baptism, that we may put Him on, and in His Supper, that we may eat Him *by faith and spirit,* and mad have everlasting life by His cross and blood. And we say not, this is done slightly and coldly, but *effectually* and *truly.* For although *we do* NOT TOUCH *the* BODY *of Christ*

with teeth and mouth, yet we hold Him fast, and eat Him *by faith, by understanding and by the spirit.* And this is no vain *faith which doth comprehend Christ*; and that is not received with cold devotion, which is received *with understanding, with faith, and with spirit.*" (Pages 63, 64.)

IV.

"We justly blame the bishops of Rome, who, without the word of God, without the authority of the holy fathers, without any example of antiquity, after a new guise, do not only *set before the people* the sacramental *bread to be* WORSHIPPED as God, but do also carry the same about upon an ambling horse." (Ibid, p. 64.)

V.

" It is our *faith* that applieth the death and cross of Christ to our benefit, and *not the act of the* massing *priest.* 'Faith had in the sacraments,' saith Augustine, 'doth justify, and not the sacraments.' And Origen saith, 'Christ is the *priest*, the *propitiation*, and *sacrifice;* which propitiation cometh to every one *by mean of* FAITH.' So that by this reckoning, we say that the sacraments of Christ without faith do not once profit these that be alive: a great deal less do they profit those that be dead." (Pages 64, 65.)

VI.

" We affirm together with the antient fathers, that the body of Christ *is* NOT eaten *but of the* GOOD *and* FAITHFUL and of those that are endued with the Spirit of Christ." (Ibid, p. 92.)

VII.

"These men have changed all things, contrary to Christ's institution, and have made a private mass of the holy communion. And so it cometh to pass, that WE give *the Lord's Supper* unto the people, and THEY give them a *vain pageant* to GAZE *on*." (Ibid, p. 92.)

VIII.

" *Their* doctrine is, that Christ's very body effectually, and, *as they speak*, REALLY and SUBSTANTIALLY, may not only be *eaten* of WICKED and UNFAITHFUL MEN, but also (which is monstrous to be spoken) of mice and dogs." (Page 92.)

IV.

Bullinger's Decades.

Although Henry Bullinger's name is not very often heard now, he was a very remarkable man. And though he was never in England, the thread of his life, is, in part, closely interwoven with the history of the English Reformed Church, in which he took a deep interest, and which may be truly said to owe much to him.

He was born 1504 not very far from Zurich.

"In his childhood he was preserved several times from

imminent perils; once from the plague and risk of premature interment; again, when by a fall in the street a whistle which was in his hand was driven into his neck; and again, when the enticement of a beggar would have stolen him from his home and friends."

From school at Emmerick he went to the University of Cologne 1519. Here he studied diligently the ancient Fathers. Here also he met with some of the earlier writings of Luther and Melancthon. Here also days and nights spent in the study of the New Testament were followed by an opening of his mind and heart to the reception of the Gospel.

For six years after 1523 Bullinger was engaged as a teacher of monks and students in the Cistercian Convent of Cappel. Here he formed aquaintance with Zuingle and Leo Judæ and was led by the former to the entire renunciation of the Corporal Presence in the Sacrament.

"In December of the same year, the senate of Zurich deputed Bullinger to accompany Zuingle to the important disputation at Berne. On his return he was prevailed on to undertake the pastoral office; and preached his first sermon on Sunday, June 21, 1528, at the village of Husen, near Cappel."

After incessant preachings and expositions in the neighbourhood of Bremgarten, in 1531 he succeeded Zuingle in the preachership of the Cathedral at Zurich.

"In this important post Bullinger continued for the remainder of his long life, labouring with most assiduous diligence and wide spread influence. For several years from 1531 to 1538, his preachings were daily, sometimes

twice in the day; his publications, of which many were suggested by passing events, were voluminous and frequent; his pastoral and synodical, civil and ecclesiastical engagements were unceasing and very various; his correspondence was exceedingly extensive and critical: and his house was always open, and his interpositions ready to shelter and befriend especially refugees from every country where religious persecution raged. And during the protracted efforts to effect a reconciliation between the Lutherans and the Church of Zurich on the sacramentarian question, his moderation and sincerity were eminently conspicious."

"In his extant diary Bullinger has marked March 29, 1547, as the day when Hooper and his wife, in their exile, accomplished their long-cherished desire of visiting him; and March 24, 1549, when they left him for England with their daughter Rachel, his godchild. In the end of May of the last mentioned year also Calvin and Farell came to Bullinger, and a consensus or agreement was completed on the subject of the Lord's Supper, between the Churches of Geneva and Zurich. At the same instant, as appeared by various decrees in the year following, the whole weight of the Papal party, imperial and ecclesiastical, was combining to condemn Bullinger and all his writings. But nothing turned him aside from his steady course of usefulness; and early in 1554 the largest influx of English refugees enjoyed his sympathy and interest. Among them were Parkhurst, Jewel, Horn, Pilkington, Lever, Hum-

phrey and Cole. Italian exiles from Locarno also sought and obtained like shelter in Zurich, through his interventions, in the spring of the year following."

"Early in October 1574, his last and fatal disorder attacked him. In the first instance, indeed, the severity of the seizure yielded so far to the remedies that were applied that he was able to resume his public duties. But the disease returned on the 24th of May in the year following with excruciating violence, and lasted until the 17th of September, when, after exhibiting a bright example of Christian patience, and having taken a touching personal farewell of all his colleagues, and written a letter to the Senate of Zurich, to be delivered after his decease) one object of which was to commend to them Rodolph Gualter as his successor), he expired, in the exercise of much prayer and in the peace of the gospel, in the 71st year of his age."*

I cannot do better than give the following account of the authoritative sanction which was given to Bullinger's Decades, in the words of Dean Goode, (on Eucharist, ii., p. 735-6).

"At the Convocation in 1586, the archbishop and bishops agreed to certain 'Orders,' of which the first was this:— 'Every minister having cure, and being under the degrees of Master of Art and Bachelor of Law, and not licensed to be a public preacher, shall, before the 2nd day of February

* See Biographical notice at the commencement of Decade V. in Parker Society's Edition.

next, provide a Bible and Bullinger's Decads, in Latin or English, and a paper book. And shall every day read one chapter of the Holy Scriptures; and note the principal contents thereof briefly in his paper-book. And shall every week read over one sermon in the said Decads, and note likewise the chief matters therein contained in the said paper [book]. And shall once in every quarter. . . . . show his said notes to some preacher near adjoining, to be assigned for that purpose.' And by the second of these 'Orders,' the said preachers are to certify to the archdeacon or bishop, 'who do perform the said exercises, and how they have profited therein.' (Strype's Whitgift, Appendix, No. 32. iii. 194, 195. Oxf. ed. See also Wilkins's Concilia, iv. 321.) Moreover, a copy of these 'Orders' was lodged with the Secretary of State in January, 1586, (1587 new style) the month after they were agreed upon by the bishops, and deposited by him in the State Paper Office (where they still remain) and endorsed, 'Orders for the Discipline of the Church.' So that, although they may not have received the formal and written authorization of the authorities of the State, they certainly were formally brought under their notice, and received their tacit sanction. And this was one of those more important documents of which Sir Joseph Williamson, Secretary of State in the time of Charles II. had copies for greater security. And in the title page of the edition of 1587 are the words (not found in the previous editions), 'Cum gratia et privilegio Regiæ Majestatis.' And so completely were these 'Orders' considered by the archbishop

to have received public sanction, that he expected that it would be inquired into in the following Parliament, how they had been observed, as he told the bishops in circular letter sent to them in November 1588. (See Strype's Whitgift, b. iii., c. xx., p. 531; Oxf. ed." See also Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. ii., p. 563.)

The following extracts are taken from his Decades as published in four volumes by the Parker Society.

I.

"But here some move many and divers questions touching the sacramental union, whether it be personal, real, or rational. I, because I see nothing of this matter doubtfully delivered of the Apostles, and that the thing, being plain of itself, by such manner of sophistications is made dark, doubtful, difficult, and obscure; simply and plainly say, that the sign and the thing signified are joined together in the sacraments by *God's institution*, by *faithful contemplation* and *use;* to be short, in *signification* and *likeness* of the things: but I UTTERLY DENY, that those two are naturally united together, so that the sign in the sacrament beginneth to be that which the thing signified is in his own substance and nature: I DENY, that the THING SIGNIFIED is *joined* corporally with the SIGN, so that the *sign* remaineth still in his own substance and nature, and yet nevertheless, in the mean time, hath the *thing signified corporally joined unto it;* that thereby *whosoever is partaker of the sign*, should be also *by the sign or with the sign* PARTAKER *of the* THING ITSELF.

The reason why I do so *constantly* DENY *that*, appeareth, I think, sufficiently by those examples which I have hitherto declared, and which hereafter shall be declared.....My saying is, that they are coupled together in a faithful contemplation, because they which partake the sacraments religiously do not fasten their eyes on sensible things only, but rather on things insensible, signified, and heavenly; so that the FAITHFUL have in themselves BOTH TWAIN *coupled together*, which OTHERWISE *in the sign or with the sign are knit together* with NO BOND." (Vol. iv., Dec. v., pp. 278, 279.)

II.

"After the same manner is it to be seen in the institution of the Lord's Supper or Eucharist. The bread is called the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ. But since the right faith believeth, that the true body of Christ, *ascended out of this world*, liveth and *is now in heaven*, and that the Lord returneth no more into this world until He come in the clouds of heaven to judge the quick and the dead, every man understandeth, that to the sign, to wit, bread and wine, the names of the things themselves, to wit, the body and blood of Christ, are given through the communicating of names." (Ibid, p. 282.)

III.

Christian faith doth attribute the grace of God, remission of sins, sanctification and justification, fully and wholly to the free mercy of God, and to the merit of Christ's passion; yea, in such sort doth Christian faith attribute these spiritual benefits unto it, that beside it nothing at all is admitted to

take part with it. Therefore where as Lombard saith, 'That *sacraments have received power* to confer or give grace by the merit of the passion of Christ, it is of HIS OWN FORGING. For as Christ giveth not His glory to any, either saint or mortal man, much less to a creature without life; even so he that believeth to be fully justified by the death and resurrection of the Lord, seeketh no further grace and righteousness in any other thing than in Christ only, upon whom he stayeth, whom also by faith he feeleth in his heart or mind already to exercise His force by the Holy Ghost.'" (Ibid, p. 304.)

IV.

"About this matter Bonaventura hath wonderfully busied himself, who in his writing, *In* 4. *Magistri Distinct., Quæst.* 3, among other things at the length saith: 'We must not say by any means that *grace is contained* substantially in the sacraments, as water in a vessel, or as a medicine in a box; yea, to understand it so, it is erroneous. But they are said to contain grace, in that they *signify* grace; and because, unless there be a want on the part of the receiver, grace is always *given in them:* so that ye must understand that grace is *in the soul,* and *not in the visible signs.* For this cause they are called also vessels of grace. They may be also called vessels after another manner, because, as that which is in a vessel is no part of it, neither cometh of it, and yet nevertheless is drawn out of; so grace cometh *neither of nor by* the sacraments, but springeth from the eternal fountain, and is drawn

out from thence by the soul in the sacraments." (Ibid, pp. 307, 308.)

v.

"But before I entreat further of the other ends of the supper, consisting in the description thereof; I will recite what other some allege of the promise and communion of Christ. They condemn our doctrine as heretical. For they contend, that the Lord promised that He would give unto the faithful His *very body and blood*, to be eaten and drunken *under the form of bread and wine;* therefore it must by all means, and without all contradiction, be believed, that the bread is the Lord's natural body, and the wine His blood; and that these ought to be eaten and drunken, not only spiritually, but also corporally, unto life everlasting. And that Christ is bodily present in the supper, and that the bread is His body and the wine His blood, thus they prove: That which the Lord speaketh cannot be false, for He is the truth itself; but He saith, that the bread is His body, and the wine His blood; therefore the bread and wine of the sacrament are verily, really, and essentially the body and blood of Christ. Which truth, they say, must simply be believed, although reason itself, the whole world, all senses, and nature itself, be against it. We answer: That indeed all things are *very true which the Lord hath spoken*, who is truth itself; but *in that sense* which He Himself said and understood, not in that meaning which we will enforce upon His words. Wherefore before all things we must search out *the true*

sense of *the Lord's words* in the supper, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood, etc.'

"These men cry out, saying, that the Lord's words ought to be expounded simply, and according to the letter; for they are the words of a testament; and that permitteth not His words to be expounded by a trope or figure. But we say, that all the evangelical and apostolical books are numbered under the title of the testament; and therefore throughout all and every place of the Scripture nothing must be corrupted, nothing added, nothing diminished, unless we will be subject to the curse of God. And yet we we are also constrained to confess, that there be infinite sentences in the Holy Scriptures, which, if we will proceed to expound simply according to the letter, we shall overthrow the whole Scripture and the true faith, or we shall seem to charge the Scriptures with lies and contradiction." (Ibid, pp. 435, 436.)

VI.

"Now it is manifest, that He spake of His true sensible body when He saith, 'This is my body,' for He addeth, 'Which is broken or given for you.' But the true, natural, sensible, or human body was delivered and died for us. But this appeareth not in the bread, or under the bread. Wherefore the Lord's words must be *expounded*. . . .Neither is there any cause why they should here, as it were, casting their mists before our eyes, and apply their coloured interpretation unto a rotten construction, using words,

'UNSPEAKABLY, SUPERNATURALLY, INVISIBLY, NOT QUALITIVELY, NOT QUANTIVELY, NOT AS IN A PLACE.' For by these terms they, intending in the meanwhile to bring some other thing to pass, do by the wonderful judgement of God quite subvert and overthrow all that is their own. For if this their mystery be unspeakable, why then do they use these terms, 'ESSENTIALLY, SUBSTANTIALLY, REALLY, CORPORALLY?' For they that speak so, do utter truly and set down the manner of His presence. If the bread be *supernaturally* the body of Christ, why then do they add *naturally?* And if the bread be Christ's body invisibly, then can it not be corporally, neither can it be a TRUE BODY, whose property is to be visible. Who would not laugh, if he should hear that fire burnt and gave no heat, and that light did shine and gave no light? If He be not present in quality, quantity, and as in a place, then is He *not corporally* present. For, I pray you, are not *qualities, quantities, and place,* belonging to the *body?* Hearken what Augustine saith unto Dardanus touching the presence of God: 'Take,' saith he, '*space of place* from *bodies,* and they shall be NOWHERE; and because they shall be nowhere, they shall *not be* AT ALL. Take the *bodies themselves* from the *qualities of bodies,* and they shall be NOWHERE; and therefore it must needs be they *cannot be* AT ALL.' Let not us therefore rob or spoil the LORD'S BODY of the *properties* thereof, and so deny the TRUTH *of* HIS BODY." (Ibid, pp. 443, 444. See also vol. iii., Dec. iv., pp. 263—267.)

VII.

"Paul saith: 'Declare the Lord's death UNTIL HE COME.' For thus we gather thereby: He whose remembrance is repeated until He come or return, He surely is not counted to be present, but is looked for to come; therefore the Lord's body which was given for us, the remembrance whereof is celebrated in the mystical supper, is NOT PRESENT, but is looked for to come." (Ibid p. 446.)

VIII.

"These sayings of the clarified body (which is that which ascended, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father) repugn wholly with *ubiquity* or being in *every place* and the *insensibility* of Christ's body; which notwithstanding must needs be granted, if we proceed to enforce the REAL PRESENCE of Christ's body out of the words of the supper simply understood." (Ibid p. 447.)

IX.

"For I am FLAT AGAINST that BODILY PRESENCE of Christ *in the bread*, which the papists defend and enforce upon the Church of God." (Ibid p. 452.)

X.

"In this present place, by a trope or allegory, he biddeth us to eat and drink the flesh and blood of Christ unto everlasting life. Therefore to eat Christ's flesh and

drink His blood is *nothing else but to* BELIEVE THAT CHRIST'S BODY WAS GIVEN FOR US AND HIS BLOOD SHED FOR US, *to the remission of sins;* and consequently, that we remain in Christ, and have Christ remaining in us. For the faith, whereof we spake, is not only an imagination or thought concerning things past and exceeding our capacity; but a *most certain assurance*, and a feeling of heavenly things received within in us, to our great commodity. For therefore not only faith, but the virtue and force of faith, is by the Lord signified in John by the allegory both of eating and drinking. Meat passeth not into the substance of our body without delight: so also by faith, through a great desire of the spirit, we are joined with Christ, that He may live in us, and we may live in Christ, and be partakers of all His good gifts. This is the spiritual eating of Christ, who *never thought*, no, not so much as once dreamed in this place, of the *gross* and *bodily eating*, which is indeed unprofitable. But forasmuch as the whole point of the controversy consisteth in these words of eating and drinking the flesh and blood of the Lord, they interpreting the same word bodily, and we spiritually, it seemeth good to be shewed that by the words of eating and drinking the Lord, meant *no other thing than* TO BELIEVE, and consequently to abide in Christ, and to have Christ abiding in us." (Ibid, p. 458.)

XI.

"I will recite what testimonies have been always alleged in the Church, out of the Holy Scriptures concerning the

two kinds of eating of Christ. Christ's body is eaten and His blood drunken spiritually; it is also eaten and drunken sacramentally. The spiritual manner is accomplished BY FAITH, whereby being united to Christ, we be made partakers of all His goodness. The sacramental manner is only performed in celebrating the Lord's Supper. The SPIRITUAL EATING IS PERPETUAL *unto* THE GODLY, because FAITH is to them *perpetual*. They communicate with Christ both *with out the supper and in the supper*; and by it they do more increase and continue their new beginnings, as we have also shewed before: and now, by adjoining of the holy action, all things are done more manifestly and plainly. As for the unbelievers and hypocrites, with their captain Judas, they never communicate with Christ, neither before the supper, nor in the supper, nor after the supper, inasmuch as they continue in their unbelief; but they [partake] of the Lord's sacraments to their own judgement and condemnation." (Ibid p. 463-4.)

XII.

"Wheretore the *unbelievers* do *neither* EAT THE LORD'S BODY *nor* DRINK *His* BLOOD." (Ibid, p. 465.)

These extracts from Bullinger may be thought needlessly long and numerous. It is true that one—almost *any* one—extract might have sufficed to reveal Bullinger's view of the matter before us. Yet (apart from the real value of many of the quotations) it seemed desirable to show more than this: nay, it seemed important for us to see how *thoroughly pervaded* this work of Bullinger's is with principles diametrically opposed to the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence."

It is to be specially noted, that the subject of the Sacraments generally, and of the Eucharist in particular, is very deeply entered into in the fifth book of Decades. It occupies a large portion of a thick volume. It is entered into carefully and with considerable minuteness. It is treated in a searching manner, and with evident reference to existing controversies, not only with Romanists but Lutherans; the force of its arguments being directed, indeed, much more against the Real Corporal Presence than against Transubstantiation. And without a considerable number of extracts it would be impossible to do anything like justice to the general character of the teaching of the book in this matter. The force of the evidence which the book brings to bear on the question before us depends very much on this.

I am not wishing to magnify the authority of Bullinger's Decades. It would be most unreasonable to fasten on the teaching of the Church of England everything contained in four considerable-sized octavo volumes. It is not intended to claim more than the *general* approval of the Reformed Church of England of the doctrines which they teach. No *obiter dicta*, no teaching by the way, no occasional expressions of opinion on less important matters, or on matters not controverted at the time, ought fairly to be brought forward

from a book so sanctioned, as having stamped on them the seal of the English Church. But clearly the case is very different with a question which was agitating and dividing Protestant Europe. The "Yea" or the "Nay" of a book so sanctioned on such a question, we can hardly doubt was meant to be the "Yea" or the "Nay" of the English Church.

One expression of opinion distinct and decided on such a point, at such a time, must needs have caused, that the Church of England should be held responsible for lending her sanction to such teaching. But if such teaching be found not in one isolated passage, but standing out as a strong and prominent feature in the book—outspoken plainly, defined distinctly, appearing clearly, and reappearing and recurring, and woven into the very texture of the work, and made to show itself in an attitude of marked opposition to, and declared condemnation of, the very doctrine before us; if these opinions of decided opposition to anything like the doctrine in question are indeed made to stand out in bold relief; if their outline is sharp and clear; if the impress is strong, and the indentation deep,—then I ask, Can the general approval of such a work indicate anything less than an acknowledgment that the doctrine thus taught on a question so hotly contested is, as a whole, that which the Church of England desires to teach? that on the question of the Eucharistic Presence its "Yea" is her "Yea," and its "Nay" is her "Nay"?

Let me make bold to ask (in no unkindly or irreverent spirit) any one of those who hold the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, whether if the fourth volume of Bullinger's Decades were to have fallen into his hands without his knowing what it was, he would not have felt at once that the book was one which he could never desire to recommend,

but one which he *would* desire seriously to caution anyone against, and that with the expression of strong disapproval, marking it with the stigma of very dangerous tendencies?

Has any strictly Lutheran Communion—any Communion maintaining a Real Corporal Presence—ever lent such a sanction as our Church lent to Bullinger's Decades? Would any Lutheran Communion ever think of so doing? If a strictly Lutheran Church *were* so to do, would it not be felt, by so doing, *ipso facto*, to be un-Lutheranizing herself? Then, in fairness, how are we to refuse the acknowledgment that our Church, so far as she has authorized Bullinger's Decades, has given authority to a denial of "The Real Objective Presence"?

In estimating the value of the testimony derived from these works, which have at certain times received sanction in the English Reformed Church, the Reader must be asked to observe (1) how completely they cover the whole Reformation Period. (2) How VERY DISTINCTLY they speak against any such view of the Eucharistic doctrine in that which is know by the name "Real Objective Presence." (3) That, however the sanction or quasi-authority, given to all or some of these books, may be regarded as having a temporary, rather than a permanent character, there is nothing in this to deduct from the value of their evidence as to our Church's views on this question, unless it can be shewn that our Church has since changed her mind, and has desired clearly to *unsay* that, to the *saying* of which she has here, so far, given her sanction.

No. V.

THE HOMILIES.

We have to enter now on the examination of a work which has a considerably higher claim on our attention than any which have occupied us hitherto. The two books of Homilies have a limited, but yet a marked and abiding authority given them by the statement of our Article xxxv., "The Second Book of Homilies . . . . doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, . . . as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth." We have therefore reserved the Homilies to be entered upon *next*, *before* the examination of our authorized Formularies.

In the first Book of Homilies there is no Homily, in the second Book there is one Homily, on the subject of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Our appeal to that Homily will be a very simple, and, I think, a very satisfactory process. Not so simple a task will it be, to clear away first an obstacle which bars the way; because it involves the necessity of entering, to some extent, on collateral questions which have been introduced into the discussion. For at the end of the First Book of Homilies there stands a notice concerning the Second Book *then to be* issued.

And this notice contains an expression, which is laid hold upon, by the maintainers of the Real Objective Presence, as a phrase necessarily teaching their doctrine, and as deliberately inserted and retained by the Church of England.

The notice is this—"Hereafter shall follow sermons . . . . of the due receiving of His blessed Body and Blood, *under the form of bread and wine*."

That we may be able therefore to enter on an unprejudiced view of the teaching of our Homily itself, it will be necessary for us first to deal with the objection which lies at the threshold; one which our opponents seem to regard as of the highest importance; and one, against the removal of which they seem to have concentrated their strength. This objection appears to be the chiefest of their strongholds, and one from which they seem to think, it must be impossible for them to be driven.

It is this importance attached to the matter by those who differ from us, which makes it necessary to occupy some space in dealing with it, and calls for the request that my readers will give careful attention to a question which might otherwise appear trivial.

My plan will be to aim at shewing three things:

1st. That it is like straining at a gnat, to attempt to fasten any doctrine, as the doctrine of the Church of England, on words standing *where* and *as* this expression stands.

2ndly. That even if these words were in the highest degree authoritative, there is nothing really in them on which the doctrine in question can fairly be fastened.

3rdly. That, therefore, the way is quite clear for an unbiassed examination of the Homily itself, that IT may bear witness, as to what the doctrine of the Book of Homilies really is on the question.

I. I am to show that the position and relation of the words is such that it is like straining at a gnat to fasten on them any doctrine as the doctrine of the Church of England.

Let me endeavour to lead to a fair view of this matter by help of an illustration.

Supposing I had once held the doctrine of transubstantiation or consubstantiation, and while thus holding, I put forth a volume of sermons, and on the last page had printed a notice, declaring my intention of writing hereafter another volume, in which I purposed to treat among other matters "of the due receiving of the blessed body and blood of Christ under the form of bread and wine," (expressing myself in language common among Romanists and not unused by Lutherans.) And supposing, that in after years, by further consideration and conference with friends, I had quite come over to the reformed views on the Eucharist, and now with these changed opinions I wrote as I intended on the subject, in a sermon expressive of my views, putting forth my new volume containing the promised sermon on the Eucharist, not with the title by which it was promised, but with the heading, "On the worthy receiving of the Sacrament." And suppose further, that now requiring a curate and anxious to secure one of my own way of thinking, I were to put into his hands my two volumes of sermons, asking him to declare his general adhesion to the views therein expressed—should I expect, would any one expect, that such a person, having read through and examined both volumes, would say to himself thus, "The views which I am expected to assent to are clearly those of the Real Corporal Presence, for though the second volume contains a sermon on the Lord's Supper, the teaching of which is certainly opposed to it, and shews that the writer's views are now the views of the Reformed,

yet the first volume, which was written, I know, when the writer was either a Papist on this subject, or in a sort of transition state, has appended to it a notice of this sermon as forthcoming; and there it has given to it a title, which indicates views of a different character" ?

I have no fear as to what the answer of an unprejudiced reader will be. I am sure THIS *would* be regarded as straining at a gnat indeed.

But then are the cases parallel? Sufficiently parallel, I think, for our purpose. For—

First.—At the date of the putting forth of the First Book of Homilies (early in Edward's reign, A.D. 1547), the Church of England was in a transition state as to matters of doctrine. The Reformation effected in Henry VIII.'s reign may be spoken of as political, rather than doctrinal, or, at least (for the matter of doctrine), incipient and preparatory, rather than actual or attained.

In the early part of King Edward's reign, when the First Book of Homilies went forth, the reforming party, with Cranmer at their head, had by no means thoroughly separated themselves, either from the *party* which adhered to the teaching of the Church of Rome, or from the *doctrines* which we now regard as the doctrines of the Church of Rome. One of the Homilies in that Book (very unexceptionable indeed in its teaching) came from the pen of Bonner. And Cranmer at that time held either the Romish or the Lutheran doctrine on the Lord's Supper.

We know that two years after this, before the publication of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., 1549, there was a long and earnest dispute among the bishops, whether transubstantiation should be established or rejected.

And Secondly—When the Second Book of Homilies came out in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, not only does the

Homily on the Lord's Supper teach (as will be seen presently) the anti-Lutheran doctrine, but while the other Homilies (for the most part) have the same titles, or nearly the same, as those by which they were advertised or promised in the notice appended to the First Book; in the case of *this* Homily, it is observable that the title is changed. And not only so—but it is specially to be marked that the article which establishes the authority of the Homilies, does in the case of the Second Book, what it does not in the case of the First—that is, it inserts a list of their titles. And in the Article, the title of the Homily in question is *not* in the doubtful or objectionable language in which it was promised at the end of the First: but is the altered and amended title by which it is headed in the Second. In other words, the Article knows no Homily with any such title as "Of the due receiving of Christ's blessed Body and Blood, under the form of Bread and Wine." But it sets down the title of the Homily in question as "Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ"; while in the "Table of Homilies ensuing," which stands at the commencement of the Second Book, it is named simply "Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament"; and the Heading which stands before the Homily itself is, "An Homily of the worthy receiving, and reverent esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ."

I submit therefore, that words in such a position (appended to the First Book of Homilies), and in such a relation (to the Second Book of Homilies containing the Homily promised) cannot have fastened on them any doctrine, as a doctrine taught by the Church of England.

II. But I contend, secondly, that even if these words carried with them the highest symbolical authority, there

is actually nothing in them on which the doctrine in question can fairly be fastened.

I am quite aware that in maintaining this, I am maintaining what to most people will seem paradoxical. Yet, not the less do I hope to maintain and establish it.

It is quite true that the phrase "under the form of bread and wine," was, in England at least, almost given up to the Romanists.

It is true, also, that this phrase (as connected with *the Presence*) "being under the forms of bread and wine" was most emphatically repudiated by Cranmer, and repudiated by him on behalf of the English Church and her Prayer Book. For when Gardiner (perhaps having in his mind the very notice before us) alleged that they who teach that "Christ is in the bread and wine" "agree in form of teaching with that the Church of England teacheth at this day, in the distribution of the holy communion, in that it is there said, *the body and blood of Christ to be under the form of bread and wine*," (in Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 51,)—the answer of Cranmer (and it is an answer to be carefully observed) was this; "As concerning the form of doctrine used in this Church of England in the Holy Communion, that the body and blood of Christ be under the forms of bread and wine, when you shall show *the place where* THIS FORM OF WORDS IS EXPRESSED, then shall you purge yourself of that, which in the meantime I take to be a PLAIN UNTRUTH." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 53.)

Cranmer, therefore, I repeat, on behalf of our Formularies (in the moulding of which his influence was supreme) repudiated a phrase which implied *presence* "under the form of bread and wine." And it seems to me clear, that in these words of Cranmer must be a repudiation also of all authority for the notice at the end of the First Book of

Homilies, if the words contained in that notice are to be held as implying anything equivalent to "the presence of Christ's body and blood under the form of bread and wine." Anyhow, the thing specially to be noticed is this, that when Gardiner (by some mistake or other) asserted just what our modern Ritualists assert now—that the Church of England stands committed to a form of words equivalent to a statement of the *presence* or *being* of Christ's body and blood under the form of bread and wine; the assertion was met by a counter assertion (containing a most distinct denial) from one, who above all others was competent to make it.

But I must be allowed to contend that "*to be* RECEIVED under the form of bread and wine" is not equivalent to *being under* or *being* PRESENT *under* the form of bread and wine," that the receiving under the form of bread and wine implies, of necessity, no "being" or "being present" under these forms—except it be (in the language of our Reformers) only *sacramentally* or *symbolically*, that is NOT REALLY, but *representatively;* and that the objections which might lie against the one form of expression, do not necessarily lie against the other. Does not the receiving of one thing under the form of another thing rather imply the absence than the presence of the thing received? Many things are continually being *conveyed* and *received* under the forms of papers signed and parchments sealed, which certainly are *never present* under the forms of the paper or parchment.

And as a mere matter of fact, I will cite instances to show that the phrase "under the form of bread and wine," was not regarded by the Reformers as, of necessity, implying a doctrine which they rejected; but was sometimes (though rarely) used or allowed (by divines most distinctly opposed to the Corporal Presence,) sometimes in language speaking of

giving or *receiving* the "Res sacramenti" *under these forms*, (or the like), and sometimes even in language speaking of the *being* or *being present* of the "Res sacramenti," (NOT REALLY, but *sacramentally* or *symbolically*) under these forms.

(1) First I must direct special attention to what was said by Ridley, when, in his disputation at Oxford, he had to deal with the proposition that "In the sacrament of the altar, by virtue of God's word spoken by the priest, the natural body of Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, and His natural blood, are really *present under the forms of bread and wine*." Ridley complains that the proposition is "very obscure and dark, by means of sundry words of doubtful signification." And while repudiating the proposition as "false and erroneous" in "the sense which the schoolmen teach," he goes on to point out its ambiguities. Among others (pertaining to the earlier part of the proposition, with which we are not here concerned) he numbers the word "*really*" (*really present*), granting in one sense "Christ's body to be really in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper:" and also "these words, *under the forms of bread and wine*," *in which* he says, "there is a further *doubtfulness* . . . whether the *forms* be there taken to signify the only accidental and outward *shews* of bread and wine; or therewithal the substantial natures thereof, which are to be seen by their qualities, and perceived by exterior senses."

And going on to condemn the Romish sense (which take away the substances) as *false* and *erroneous*, and as a *detestable* heresy; he seems to imply that the expression "under the forms of bread and wine" (when so understood as to *include* "the substantial natures thereof") was quite capable of being so explained as not to convey a false or erroneous sense.

Indeed, I think, putting Ridley's words here beside his

other sayings, it is clear that with the addition of the word "*sacramentally*" (which will be equivalent to Bishop Bilson's συμβολικῶς to be quoted presently, and which means, as we have seen, "*not* really"), Ridley would have had no hesitation in allowing the phrase "present under the form of bread and wine" as not incapable of bearing a meaning which he would have approved.

He evidently seems to mean that in the sense in which he knows the doctrinal statement to be proposed to him, he could by no means accept it; but yet that the terms of the statement were capable of being so emptied of that sense as to contain nothing more than he could approve; and that, under protestation of excluding such other sense, he would not feel himself bound altogether to refuse the very words of the proposition submitted to him. Much more then, I think, would Ridley have allowed the phrase "*received* under the form of bread and wine," as quite capable of being understood in a sound and anti-Lutheran sense.

It appears to me (and I incline to think that all who study Ridley's words attentively will come to the same conclusion) that (1) there are two requirements in Ridley's mind, in order to his accepting the words "really present under the form of bread and wine"; (2) that these requirements demand, in Ridley's judgment, no sense to be put on the words but what they may fairly be made to bear, (only that he is well aware that their *doubtfulness* admits also another sense which his adversaries notoriously would have them convey); (3) that these requirements are (*a*) that "really" shall be understood *transcendenter*, (which will exclude the *corporal* or *objective* sense, and leave the *sacramental*); and (*b*) that "forms" shall be understood to include *material substances*.

Let this much be conceded, and Ridley will demand no

alteration in the words "really present under the forms of bread and wine."

Does Ridley make any objection to the phrase beyond that which pertains to the ambiguities which would thus be removed?

Does not his language imply that (however his opponents might object) the words themselves might well bear the removal, and then might be admitted as true?

Setting aside the difficulty which may be in the words "really present," which do NOT *appear* in the Homily notice, and regarding only those words which *do* appear in the notice, it may be said, I think, to be with Ridley, as with Foxe, that THE *stumbling-block* is in the word *forms*, which word might not unnaturally import, and in the mouths of Romanists was always understood to mean, the outward shows alone, when all the material substance was gone. Only let this doubtfulness be removed, only let it be understood that the word "forms" does not exclude the substance of the elements, and Ridley, it seems, would be content to admit the phrase "under the forms of bread and wine."

(2) I cite next the testimony of Jewel, which is very similar to Ridley's. Thrice Harding quotes against him these words of St. Augustine: "Caro ejus, quam forma panis opertam in sacramento accipimus; et sanguis ejus, quem, sub vini specie et sapore potamus; caro videlicet carnis, et sanguis est sacramentum sanguinis."

On one occasion Harding says: "In these words of St. Augustine we see the flesh of Christ called a sacrament of his flesh, and the blood a sacrament of his blood, inasmuch as they be covered with the form of bread and wine, yet verily and in substance present."

Now, how does Jewel deal with this argument and this

quotation? *First*, he shows that "form" does not imply *absence of substance*. *Then* as to "operta" (covered), he shows that similar expressions are used, where bodily presence is out of the question. He quotes (among others) St. Gregory, "Christus . . in hoc mysterio moritur," where the gloss saith, "Moritur, id est, mors ejus repræsentatur," (Christ dieth, that is to say, his death is represented.) "Now," says Jewel, "as Christ *dieth in* the sacrament, so is his *body present* in the sacrament. But Christ dieth NOT there REALLY and INDEED; therefore Christ's BODY is NOT THERE VERILY AND INDEED." And he adds, "I thought it needful to use the more examples on this behalf, for that this place of St. Augustine seemeth to carry the greatest force of all others. But as St. Augustine saith here, Christ's body is hidden under the form or kind of bread: even so he saith 'The grace of God lay hidden in the Old Testament.' . . Again St. Augustine saith, 'The New Testament was hidden in the Old.' But he expoundeth himself, 'It was *hidden*, that is to say, it was *secretly signified*.' And thus, by St. Augustine's own words and exposition, we may likewise say, 'Christ's flesh is privily *hidden*, that is to say,' as St. Augustine expoundeth it, 'it is PRIVILY SIGNIFIED.'" And Jewel concludes his argument by saying, "Thus St. Augustine's meaning may well stand upright without any new secrecy or real or fleshly presence." (Harding, Thess. etc., pp. 617—619; see also pp. 796, 797.)

But St. Augustine's meaning, which may thus stand upright, is conveyed in words remarkably like our Homily Notice. St. Augustine says, "We RECEIVE his flesh, covered with the *form* of *bread*, and his *blood under* the *form* and flavour of *wine*." And the words of the notice are "of the due RECEIVING of his blessed body and blood, under the form of bread and wine."

I think, I cannot then be wrong, in saying that, however undesirable it might be thought *now* to use such language as, in St. Augustine's time, might give no occasion of misunderstanding, yet clearly in Jewel's judgment the words of the Notice "may well stand upright," and that without any "real or fleshly presence."

(3) Next I will quote from Calvin, who affirms, "In the Supper Christ Jesus, viz., His body and blood, is truly given *under the signs of bread and wine*." (Inst., iv. 17, § 32.)

I give the words *verbatim* as translated and quoted, with approval, by Jeremy Taylor, who regards them as expressing "OUR sense of the REAL PRESENCE." (Real Presence, 1, § 5. Works, Edit. Eden, vol. vi., p. 14.)

And I do this, on purpose that the expression may be seen to bear the seal of approval of an eminent English prelate—a seal too, set upon it in a treatise which is most distinct and emphatic in denying and repudiating, and condemning the doctrine of "the Real Presence" in any such sense as that in which it is taught by our opponents.

Here that is said of the *giving*, which in the Notice is said of the *receiving;* and the only difference in expression is the use of the word "signs" instead of "form," which I imagine (the doctrine of transubstantiation being not in question) all will allow to be perfectly immaterial. Indeed in the declaration of the twenty-one clergymen, both these expressions are used as equivalents, or the one as the explanation of the other, for it is there said, "are present . . . . under 'the outward visible part or *sign*' *or* '*form* of bread and wine.'"

(4) My next quotation shall be from "The defence of a certain poor Christian man, who else should have been condemned by the Pope's law." It was translated by Coverdale, and the translation is given in Coverdale's Works

(P. S. Edit., "Remains," p. 450, *sqq.*) There it is said, "The memorial of Christ's holy Supper was institute by himself *under both the forms of bread and wine.*" (Page 472.)

And again, a little further, "Christ . . . . did not for nought, or without a cause, ordain this remembrance *under both forms of bread and wine.*"

This language, it will be observed, carries the sanction of both the writer and the translator, neither of whom can be supposed to be supporters of the Corporal Presence.

And here is a saying which will very well justify the phrase of the Notice before us. For if it be right to say that Christ instituted this memorial *under the forms of bread and wine*, and it is not in question that in that memorial we receive the body and blood of Christ, it cannot be in the proper language of the Reformed, incorrect to say that we receive Christ's body and blood "under the form of bread and wine."

(5) The next citation shall be from the examination of William Thorpe, 1407, given in Bales' Works (P. S. Edit., p. 71). "I believe that in the day next before that he would suffer passion on the morn, *in form of bread and wine*, he ordained the sacrament of his flesh and blood, that is, his own precious body, and gave it to his apostles for to eat." A similar phrase is used by Thorpe, as expressive of his belief, in p. 92. But I do not dwell upon these forms of expression as used by Thorpe, about whose views on this subject we may not be able to speak very certainly. I wish only to call attention to the marginal note or gloss on Thorpe's words, "That is *under the creatures of bread and wine*," as indicating, that thus explained (and the Ritualists would themselves so explain it) the words might be understood in a sense not to be disallowed by the reformed. The

words indeed of Thorpe are but just equivalent to the words before cited as translated and allowed by Coverdale.

(6) My next quotation shall be from Bishop Bilson, who while condemning the Papists for *shrouding* Christ "under the forms of bread and wine," and teaching that "the sacrament is not, but only annexed as a sign to the heavenly grace and virtue of Christ mightily present," has the following very observable passage :—

"*Phi.* (*Philander, the Jesuit*) By this place [of the Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite] you see Christ is *covered* WITH THE FORMS OF BREAD AND WINE, as with garments, and that is word for word our opinion.

"*Theo.* (*Theophilus, the Christian*) Add συμβολικῶς, *figuratively*, as your author doth, and then both YOUR REAL PRESENCE IS OVERTHROWN, *and the doctrine which we teach clearly established.* For we confess that Christ worketh in us, and *presenteth Himself* unto us in these mysteries, as it were, in certain *veils and coverings*, which, *mystically*, by way of *signification* and *spiritual operation, contain and clothe* His grace and truth : but NOT REALLY, nor by *material or corporal inclusion*, as you affirm ; and so Himself expresseth His mind in this very chapter. . . . Christ is SIGNIFIED and *received* by these signs and figures . . . . but that *Christ is locally or substantially closed within the forms of bread and wine* . . . . Dionysius hath no such sense nor words. . . . . signs and figures the ancient fathers do not take for *shows* and *accidents*, as you do, but for *substantial* and usual *creatures*." (True Difference, etc., Edit. 1585, pages 716, 717.)

Here we have an author most clearly disallowing both the Romish and Lutheran view, yet declaring that "the doctrine we teach" may be fairly expressed and *established* by the expression covered *with the forms of bread and wine*, understood as they should be understood, *figuratively*. And that because "Christ is signified and *received by these signs*." Clearly then in his view, there could be no question, that there might well be a right and sound understanding of the phrase "received under the form of bread and wine."

(7) Equally conclusive as to the matter before us are the words of Bishop Morton, who in his views of opposition to the Corporal Presence was in thorough accord with our Reformers. He writes thus:—"In this sacrament . . . . His precious body and blood . . . . conveyed . . . . *under the signs* and seals of *bread and wine* consecrated to that use." (Catholic Appeal, lib. ii., ch. ii., sec. 28, p. 130.) Clearly then, I think it appears that Bishop Morton, with all his strong repugnance to the doctrine of the Corporal Presence, would have felt no difficulty in accepting the terms of the notice before us.

(8) I may add that Bishop Nicholson, whose views (though he has been quoted in its support) were very clearly opposed to the "Real Objective Presence," has sanctioned this same form of expression, as capable of conveying only the notion of a relative Presence. He says, "The Eucharist is a sacrament instituted by Christ *under the elements of bread and wine*, to represent, exhibit, and seal the passion of Christ and the benefits thereof to a worthy communicant." (Exposition of Catechism, Edit., Oxford, 1866, p. 215.)

Again, speaking of the different forms of speech used to express the Eucharistic Presence, he maintains that many expressions used by Lutherans may be understood in a

sense not to be objected to. He says, "All the words used by divines in this mystery may receive a candid interpretation, except that of Rome. 1. That Christ is in the sacrament corporally, substantially, and perhaps consubstantially, may have a respect to the subject or supposite, of the *relatum or correlatum*, their meaning no more than that he is *there under the forms of bread and wine, not changed in substance* BUT IN USE; as it is in other relations; as, for example, betwixt a father and a son: who though they relate to each other, yet they remain two distinct substances, and the same they were." (Ibid, p. 216.) Here we have an expression certainly not less objectionable than that of the Homily notice, yet certainly not used to express any Real Objective Presence.

(9) To these examples I will add that of Bishop Patrick, who while maintaining that "the REAL PRESENCE IS NOT TO BE SOUGHT IN THE BREAD AND WINE, BUT IN THOSE THAT RECEIVE THEM, according as learned Hooker speaks," yet has not hesitated to say that Christ "doth exhibit himself unto us UNDER THESE SHADOWS OF BREAD AND WINE;"* words which certainly so far as they differ from the formula in the notice differ in the way of making it more objectionable. At least it seems absolutely necessary to understand the word *shadows* here as being used in a sense precisely equivalent to *forms* or *signs*, not as having anything *shadowy* in their nature, beyond their *inferior* relation to the higher REALITIES and the correct resemblance which shadows bear to their real substances. Just as we shall presently find our Homily exhorting us so to come to the Lord's table as to receive "not only the outward sacrament, but the spiritual thing also; not the figure, but the truth; not the *shadow* only, but the BODY."

It was in this sense, no doubt, that the bishop used the

* Mensa Mystica, ch. v., § iii., 4.

word. And if so, we have here a phrase which stands exactly on a level with that in the Homily notice. And we know that the writer meant to speak of no Corporal Presence.

(10) And I may venture here to add yet one other citation from one who with the Reformers stands very distinctly opposed to the Lutheran as well as the Romish doctrine of the Eucharist. I mean Dr. Waterland. He has said, after making long quotations from Bishop Barlow and Dean Aldrich, "The sum of all is, that sacramental or symbolical feeding in the Eucharist is feeding upon the body broken and the blood shed, *under the signs or symbols of bread and wine.*" ("On the Eucharist," chap. viii., Works, vol. iv., p. 607.)

Here we see how naturally a phrase, exactly equivalent to that used in the Homily notice (understanding *form* as equivalent to *signs*), comes up to express the summing up of a view of the Eucharist entirely distinct from and opposed to that of the Real Objective Presence.

These quotations, I trust, will be sufficient to establish my point—that the phrase "under the form of bread and wine," and its equivalents, standing in such connexion as that in which they stand in the notice, were not regarded by the Reformers and succeeding Divines (of the same Eucharistic views with our Reformers) as incapable of bearing a sense such as they would have approved,—and that indeed they were sometimes, though not often, actually used by them to express what they would regard as a sound view of Eucharistic doctrine.

But if this be so, then, clearly the phrase in this notice does not bear any stamp which belongs exclusively either to Romish or Lutheran doctrine. It cannot truly be said to convey of necessity a sense which is opposed to the

doctrine of the Reformed. It has been accepted already, and it might (if need were) be accepted and used again by those who deny the Corporal Presence. It might stand even in our Articles of Religion, and there not really be repugnant to, only have its sense somewhat straitly limited by, other Articles whose language is clearly determinate against the Real Objective Presence.

The case, then, I think, may fairly be said to stand thus. The notice at the end of the First Book of Homilies, contains a phrase, which in England was commonly regarded as a phrase of the Romanists. Dr. Pusey has very ably maintained that the words are quite capable of expressing the Lutheran doctrine, and as a matter of fact were so employed by the Lutherans themselves. I venture a step further, and maintain that the phrase—so far as it is used in the notice—is quite capable of bearing the Reformed sense, and as a matter of fact, was sometimes so used by Reformed Divines themselves, while maintaining their doctrines both against Romanists and Lutherans.

And this is quite sufficient to establish what I wish to prove, that the use of such an expression, even if it came in a book of the highest authority, would have no power to weigh anything against distinct doctrinal statements on the other side.

I do not for a moment admit the doctrinal authority of the notice. But even if the most unquestionable and the most supreme authority could fairly be clamed for it, I contend that the use which is made of it to support the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, must still be an abuse.

For myself, I wish to state clearly, that I do not *stand* at all upon the arguments I have brought forward as to the *innocence* of the phrase; because in my own view all

these arguments are needless. The phrase, I believe, does not come from any utterance of the Church.

But still, I have thought it worth while to show, that if any there are who may feel some suspicion on *this* point, and think the ground I stand upon myself somewhat doubtful or shaky, there is plenty of room for them to stand round about me. And with this view I maintain that the phrase does not necessarily teach *any doctrine*. It is not capable of having any doctrine in fairness fastened on it.

It would indeed, be scarcely true to say of it, what Mr. Stuart says of the word "Mass," that it is as colourless as water, as tasteless as the white of an egg. The expression has something of a colour, it has indeed something of a taste. You may say that in the colour there is certainly a Romish hue, and that the taste may have somewhat of a Lutheran flavour. But its colour and its taste are only what it has acquired by standing long in Roman shops and passing on through Lutheran hands. Its substance is older than Luther. It was known long before transubstantiation had its birth. It is, at least, as old as the fifth century. If by none before, the phrase was certainly used, as we have seen, by St. Augustine, who, on Luther's confession at least, did not teach the Corporal Presence at all. That it should convey the idea of any such Presence, is certainly not owing to anything inherent in itself. Indeed the expression, so far as used in the notice, does not, of necessity, imply any Real Presence at all. *A sacramental*, NOT REAL, presence, in the elements, and a presence of the *res sacramenti* to the faith of the receiver, is all which the terms of the expression can be said at all to require. Dr. Pusey indeed has said, arguing from this notice, "since we receive them (*i.e.* the body and blood of Christ) they *must be* THERE (*i.e.* under the form of

bread and wine), in order that we may receive them." ("Presence of Christ," p. 22.)

But when Dr. Pusey wrote these words, he was surely forgetting an illustration not unfrequently used by eminent English Divines (by one in particular whom Dr. Pusey elsewhere cites in support of his own Eucharistic views) I mean that of a legal instrument or deed of conveyance.

Surely it were nothing strange—no doing violence to the English language, no unnatural form of speech among us—if I were to say that I received an estate under the form of a piece of parchment by which it was conveyed to me. Surely I might say with perfect propriety that I received £100, under the form of a cheque or a bank-note. And my saying this would certainly not imply that the estate was brought into the room with the parchment to be signed, or that the amount of gold was there wrapped up within the note, or present at all under the form of the draft. And why then must the phrase "received under the form of bread and wine," (when we know that similar forms of expression were used by those who denied the doctrine,) be held to teach of necessity the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence?

III. If I have carried my readers with me thus far, I have little fear of their dissenting from my third proposition, that the way is clear for an unbiassed examination of the Homily itself, that it may bear witness what the doctrine of the Book of Homilies really is on the question before us.

The phrase we have been considering is quite capable of being explained and understood in what the Reformed party surely would call a sound sense. The same phrase in a more questionable connexion, as applied to the Presence,

was repudiated by Cranmer on behalf of the English Prayer Book. But the phrase as used in the notice does not imply any real presence under the forms of bread and wine.

Yet (lest doubtless it should seem to carry any Popish or Lutheran sound) it is, when the Second Book of Homilies comes forth, rejected, and another title with no such suspicious or doubtful sound substituted for it. What conclusion are we to draw from this? Surely not that the Church of England has deliberately retained a form of expression which shews that she desired to teach her children the Corporal Presence. Rather, I think, we should say, that here seems to be evidence of the care and vigilance, and wise caution of our Church, in that a form of expression—however capable of a sound sense—was deliberately rejected, lest, perchance, an unsound sense should afterwards be nailed upon it. It is, indeed, somewhat curious, certainly it strikes one as very needless, that at the end of the First Book of Homilies, this promissory notice of a Second Book to be issued should continue to stand after the promise has been fulfilled, and the Second Book had been published—that still it should be said "Hereafter shall follow etc.," when there remained no more to follow now, since the *Second* Book had been added to the *First*.

But from whatever cause, it *has* stood: and, but for the mistaken argument which has so strangely been fastened on it, we might be *thankful* that it *has* stood.

If, as some seem to think, the reprinting of the notice rests on no higher authority than that of the king's printer, then we might thank the king's printer for reprinting that which seems clearly to show the determination of our Reforming authorities to reject every vestige of the doctrine

of a Corporal Presence. If it had not been reprinted, we should, indeed, have had a Homily most full of sound doctrine, and with a title to which none can take exception. But we should not have known that that title was designedly substituted for another under which the Homily was promised, which other might have seemed to imply a doctrine which the Homily does not teach, and which the Authors of the Second Book of Homilies were resolved that they would not in any way seem even to sanction.

I submit, then, that viewed in relation to the date and history of the publication, and to the change of title and to the doctrine taught in the Homily, the only argument which can fairly be built on the notice is an argument *not for* but *against* the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence—an argument (and a very forcible one) not of its deliberate acceptance by our ecclesiastical authorities, but of their jealous care to eliminate from our authorised books every phrase on which such a doctrine might anyways be grafted.

With the way thus made clear before us, what remains will be easy.

There will be no difficulty now in showing (1) That the Homily teaches nothing but what is in full accord with the views of the Reformed. (2) That the Homily teaches much which is directly repugnant to the teaching of those who maintain the Real Objective Presence.

(1) There is indeed one passage from the Homily which has sometimes been quoted on the other side, and claimed as looking like a support of the doctrine in question. But it would be strange indeed if a book of Homilies put forth with authority at a time when, in the judgment of our opponents, theology had reached about its *lowest level* in the Church of England, should be found to be really teaching doctrine which on such a subject as the Real Presence,

would raise her theology to a level with the Church of Rome.

Of the passage referred to it will be no hard task to shew, that it simply speaks the language of some of the chiefest opponents of the Corporal Presence.

The passage alluded to is as follows: "Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent. But, as the Scripture saith, the table of Lord, the bread and cup of the Lord, the memory of Christ, the annunciation of His death, yea, the communion of the body and blood of the Lord, in a marvellous incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost (the very bond of our conjunction with Christ), is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful, whereby not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely trust to win their bodies a resurrection to immortality. The true understanding of this fruition and union, which is betwixt the body and the head, betwixt the true believers and Christ, the ancient Catholic Fathers both perceiving themselves, and commending to their people, were not afraid to call this supper, some of them the salve of immortality and sovereign preservative against death; other, a deifical com-communion; other, the sweet dainties of our Saviour, the pledge of eternal health, the defence of faith, the hope of the resurrection; other, the food of immortality, the healthful grace and the conservatory to everlasting life," p. 398.

But what, we may ask, is there here to support the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence? Is it the earnest claiming for the Lord's Supper that it should be regarded as no "vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent?" But is it not possible for us to reject the

"Real Presence" of Rome and yet at the same time to contend earnestly for all the fulness of the blessings of the Lord's Supper, to repudiate the emptying it of the riches of a present Saviour, to protest against its being reduced to bare signs? Is it not possible for us, I ask, to do this? At any rate, we thank God, it was constantly done by our Reformers.

They were continually being accused by the Papists of making the sacrament nothing but a vain ceremony; and they were continually denying the accusation. They disclaimed and disowned any such views. Such repudiation comes up almost as from one mouth and with body of voice from the hearts of our Reformers: and that often in almost the same breath with the clearest and strongest statements against the Corporal Presence.

Witness Cranmer:

"Although the sacramental tokens be only significations and figures, yet doth Almighty God *effectually work*, in them that duly receive His sacraments, those *divine and celestial operations* which he hath promised, and by the sacraments be signified. For else they were VAIN *and* UNFRUITFUL *sacraments*, as well to the godly as to the ungodly. And therefore I never said of the whole supper, that it is but a signification or a bare memory of Christ's death; but I teach that it is a SPIRITUAL REFRESHING, *wherein our souls be fed and nourished with Christ's* VERY FLESH AND BLOOD *to eternal life.* And therefore bring you forth some place in my book, where I say that the Lord's Supper is *but a* BARE SIGNIFICATION without *any effect or*

operation of God in the same; or else eat your words again, and knowledge that you untruly report me." (On Lord's Supper, p. 148.)

Witness Ridley:

"'Sir,' quoth I, 'methinks it is not charitably done, to bear the people in hand that any man doth so lightly esteem the sacrament, as to make of it BUT A FIGURE. For that maketh it (but) a BARE FIGURE *without any more profit*; which that book (*i.e.* Cranmer's Book) doth often deny as appeareth to the reader most plainly. 'Yes,' quoth he, 'that they do.' 'Sir, no,' quoth I, 'of a truth: and as for me, I ensure you I make *no less of the sacrament than thus:* I say, whosoever receiveth the sacrament, he receiveth therewith LIFE OR DEATH.'" (Works, P. S. Edit. p. 161.)

Witness Latimer:

"There is none other presence of Christ required than a spiritual presence..... And the same presence may be called A REAL PRESENCE, [because to the faithful believer there is the *real or spiritual body of Christ:*] which thing I here rehearse, lest some sycophant or scorner should suppose me, with the anabaptist, to make *nothing else* of the sacrament but a BARE AND NAKED SIGN. As for that which is feigned of many, I, for my part, take it for a Papistical invention. And therefore I think it utterly to be rejected from among God's children, that seek their Saviour in faith; and be taught among the fleshly Papists, that will be again under the yoke of antichrist." (Remains, p. 252.)

Witness Bradford (and let it be remembered that he was *burnt for maintaining* with a denial of transubstantiation—that an evil man doth not receive the body of Christ "in forma panis.")

"Away with transubstantiation. But here, lest we should make it no sacrament—for a sacrament consisteth of two things,—and lest a man should by this gather that we make it none other thing but BARE BREAD and a NAKED SIGN, and so rail at their pleasure on us, ... I will now speak a little more hereabout by God's grace, to stop their mouths. .... In that He speaketh so plainly, saying, THIS IS MY BODY, who can, may, or dare be so bold as to doubt of it? 'He is the truth' and cannot lie: He is omnipotent and can do all things: therefore it IS HIS BODY. This I believe, this I confess, and pray you all heartily to BEWARE *of these and such like words, that it is* BUT A SIGN OR A FIGURE *of His* BODY; except you will discern betwixt signs which signify only, and signs which also do represent, confirm, and seal up, or (as a man may say) give with their signification." (Sermons, etc., pp. 92—4.)

Witness Hooper:

"I believe . . . the holy sacraments (which are the second mark or badge of the true Church) to be the signs of the reconciliation and great atonement made between God and us through Jesus Christ. They are seals of the Lord's promises, and are outward and visible pledges and gages of the inward faith, and are in number only twain, that is to say, baptism and the holy Supper of the Lord. The

which two are *not* VOID *and* EMPTY, *signs, but* FULL; that is to say, they are not only signs, whereby something is signified, but also they are *such signs* as *do exhibit and give* the thing that they signify indeed." (Later Writings, p. 45.)

Witness Jewel:

"In speaking thus we mean not to abase the Lord's Supper, or to teach that it is but a COLD CEREMONY ONLY, and *nothing to be wrought* therein (as many FALSELY SLANDER US we teach). For we affirm that CHRIST doth TRULY and PRESENTLY GIVE HIMSELF WHOLLY *in His sacraments*, in baptism that we may put Him on; and in His supper, that we may eat Him by faith and spirit, and may have everlasting life by His cross and blood. And we say not this is done SLIGHTLY or COLDLY, but EFFCTUALLY and truly For, although we do not touch the body of Christ with teeth and mouth, yet we hold Him fast and eat Him by faith, by understanding, and by spirit. And it is no vain faith that comprehendeth Christ; neither is it received with cold devotion that is received with understanding, faith, and spirit. For CHRIST HIMSELF altogether is SO OFFERED and GIVEN US in these mysteries, that we may CERTAINLY KNOW we be 'FLESH OF HIS FLESH, and BONE OF HIS BONES, and that Christ continueth in us, and we in Him.'" (Apol. and Defence, p. 523.)

Witness Hooker:

"We take not baptism nor the Eucharist for bare *resemblances* or memorials of things absent, neither for *naked signs* and testimonies assuring us of grace received before, but (as

they are indeed and in verity) for means effectual whereby God when we take the sacraments delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the sacraments represent or signify." (Edit. Keble, vol. ii., p. 258.)

Now what is there in the teaching and testimony quoted from the Homily which we have not in the teaching and testimony here quoted from the Reformers? And that the teaching and testimony of the Homily is to be understood in no higher sense than the similar teaching of the Reformers is made quite clear I think by the following words which follow immediately after the passage quoted.

"All which sayings both of the Holy Scripture and godly men, truly attributed to this celestial banquet and feast, if we would often call to mind, O how would they inflame our hearts to desire the participation of these mysteries, and oftentimes to covet after this bread, continually to thirst for this food! NOT *as* SPECIALLY *regarding the* TERRENE *and* EARTHLY CREATURES which remain; but always holding fast and CLEAVING BY FAITH TO THE ROCK, whence we may suck the sweetness of everlasting salvation. And to be brief, thus much more the faithful see, hear, and know the *favourable* MERCIES *of God* SEALED, the SATISFACTION by Christ towards us CONFIRMED, and THE REMISSION of SIN ESTABLISHED." (Pages 398, 399.)

There is nothing else I think, in the Homily which need require one word to be said for the purpose of removing any seeming difficulty. Is there nothing then, at all in the Homily which can be said to look like the teaching of the

Real Objective Presence? Most emphatically it may be answered "No." What may be called the "highest teaching" of the Homily, is nothing more than can easily be matched from the writings of those who most clearly and strongly opposed everything like such a doctrine.

(2) It only remains now to bring evidence that the Homily does contain that which is repugnant to the doctrine of those who maintain the Real Objective Presence.

For this purpose the following Extracts will suffice:—

I.

"Our loving Saviour hath ordained and established the REMEMBRANCE of His great MERCY expressed in His PASSION in the institution of His heavenly supper, where every one of us must be GUESTS and NOT GAZERS, EATERS and NOT LOOKERS, FEEDING OURSELVES, and NOT *hiring other to eat for us*, that we may live by our own meat, and not perish for hunger whiles other devour all. To this His commandment forceth us, saying do ye this; drink ye all of this. To this His promise enticeth, This is my body, which is given for you; this is my blood which is shed for you. So then of necessity we must be *ourselves* PARTAKERS OF THIS TABLE, *and* NOT BEHOLDERS *of other*." (Pages 395, 396.)

II.

"Neither can he be devout, that otherwise doth presume than it was given by the author. We must then take heed, lest OF THE MEMORY IT BE MADE A SACRIFICE, lest of a COMMUNION it be made a *private eating*, lest of two parts we have but one, lest *applying it for the dead*, we *lose the fruit that be alive*." (Page 396.)

III.

"Now it followeth *to have with this knowledge* a *sure and* CONSTANT FAITH, *not only that the death of Christ is available* for the redemption of all the world, for the remission of sin and reconciliation with God the Father; but also *that He hath made upon His cross a full and sufficient sacrifice for* THEE, a *perfect cleansing of* THY *sins*, so that thou acknowledgest no other Saviour, redeemer, mediator, advocate, intercessor, but Christ only, and that thou mayest say with the apostle, that *He loved* THEE, and *gave Himself for* THEE. For this is to stick fast to Christ's promise made in His institution, TO MAKE CHRIST THINE OWN and to APPLY HIS MERITS UNTO THYSELF. Herein thou needest NO OTHER MAN'S HELP, NO OTHER SACRIFICE OR OBLATION, NO SACRIFICING PRIEST, *no* MASS, *no means established by man's invention.* That FAITH is a NECESSARY INSTRUMENT in all these holy ceremonies, we may thus assure ourselves, for that, as St. Paul saith, without faith it is impossible to please God." (Page 399.)

IV.

"It is well known that the meat we seek for in this supper is spiritual food, the nourishment of our soul, a heavenly refection, and not earthly; an invisible meat, and not bodily; a ghostly substance, and not carnal; so that *to think that* WITHOUT FAITH *we* MAY ENJOY the EATING AND DRINKING THEREOF, or that that is the fruition of it, is but to dream a GROSS CARNAL FEEDING *basely objecting*

and BINDING OURSELVES TO THE ELEMENTS AND CREATURES.

Whereas, by the advice of the Council of Nicene we ought to lift up our minds by faith, and leaving these inferior and earthly things, there seek it where the sun of righteousness ever shineth. Take then this lesson O thou that art desirous of this table, of Emissenus, a godly father, that when thou goest up to the reverend communion, to be satisfied with spiritual meats, thou LOOK UP WITH FAITH upon the *holy body and blood of thy God*, thou marvel with reverence, thou *touch it with the mind*, thou receive it with the *hand of thy* heart, and thou take it fully with thy inward man." (Pages 399, 100.)

V.

"The *unbelievers* and *faithless* CANNOT *feed upon that precious body*. Whereas the *faithful* have their life, their abiding in Him, their union, and as it were their incorporation with Him. Wherefore let us prove and try ourselves unfeignedly without flattering ourselves, whether we be plants of the fruitful olive, living branches of the true vine, members indeed of Christ's mystical body, whether God hath purified our hearts by faith, to the sincere acknowledging of His gospel and embracing of His mercies in Christ Jesus; so that at this His table we receive *not only the outward sacrament*, but THE SPIRITUAL THING also, not *the figure, but* THE TRUTH; not the *shadow only, but* THE BODY; not to death, but to life; not to destruction, but to salvation; which God grant us to do through the merits of our Lord and Saviour; to whom be all honour and glory for ever." (Page 400.)

To these extracts from the Homily "Concerning the Sacrament," we may add yet another from "The Second Part of the Sermon for Whitsunday."

VI.

"Now if we will compare this with the Church of Rome, not as it was in the beginning, but as it is presently, and hath been for the space of nine hundred years and odd; you shall well perceive the state thereof to be so far wide from the nature of the true Church, that nothing can be more. For neither are they built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, retaining the sound and pure doctrine of Christ Jesu; neither yet do they order the sacraments or else the ecclesiastical keys, in such sort as He did first institute and ordain them: but have so intermingled their own traditions and inventions, by chopping and changing, by adding and plucking away, that now they seem to be converted into a new guise. Christ commended to His Church *a* SACRAMENT *of His body and blood: they have* CHANGED *it into a* SACRIFICE *for the quick and the dead.*" (Page 414.)

Strained attempts may be made to fasten on some of these passages something else than their natural meaning. But, as a whole, they may be safely left to speak for themselves as to the question before us.

Those who read them carefully will not long hesitate as to which side of the controversy they fairly belong to.

Those who have any aquaintance with the teaching of the Ritualists will be ready to pronounce at once, "This is not the language of those who now teach the Real Objective Presence."

No. VI.

THE CATECHISM.

We have to enter now on what may be called a new field of enquiry. A wide interval separates between the writings and books which have been before us hitherto, and those documents which may be strictly called the Authorized Formularies of our Church. We are passing from *works* of *some* authority to works of a far higher authoritative value. We come now to examine teaching which we find in our Prayer Book.

And desiring to proceed still upon the same plan of ascending from those of lower, step by step, to those of higher authoritative importance, I take the Catechism first. And my plan will be to show:—

I. That it is historically impossible that the teaching of the Catechism on the Lord's Supper can have been intended or understood to teach the Real Objective Presence.

II. That the Catechism uses no language on this subject but what is the common language of Reformed Protestants.

III. That the language of the Catechism is the proper language to express the views of those who deny the Real Objective Presence.

IV. That the language of the Catechism is repugnant to the views of those who hold the Real Objective Presence.

I. I am to show first—that it is historically impossible that the teachings of the Catechism on the Lord's Supper can have been intended, or understood to teach the Real Objective Presence.

The Conference at Hampton Court, at which this addition concerning the Sacraments was added, was held for the purpose of conciliating the Puritans. This addition itself was made to meet the views of the Puritans, and the general result of the Conference was regarded as a concession to the Puritans, so far as it went. So that the king, anxious not to seem to have gone too far in the way of yielding, was careful to make it understood that the matters conceded were not important, and were rather explanations than alterations.

It was, indeed, at first thought, that the concessions were more important than they afterwards proved, and hence arose some considerable disappointment and discontent. No doubt, also, there were exceptions subsequently taken to some particulars contained in the part added to the Catechism. And in respect of the most important of these an alteration was made at the last Review to meet the views of the Puritans. But still, on the whole, what was done at the Hampton Court Conference, including this addition to the Catechism, was understood to be, *so far*, a yielding to the desires of the complainants. And, as the result of this we are told of Rainolds, and the other agents for the Nonconformists that, (after hearing read "the few alterations, or rather explanations, of the Common Prayer agreed by the king and the bishops,") "they assented, seemed

satisfied with the result of the Conference, and promised to regard the bishops as their spiritual fathers, and perform all duty to them."

We are told also of another eminent Nonconformist, who, shortly after this, (I do not say in consequence of this), from an opponent, became a warm supporter of the Church of England. Was this addition then regarded as teaching a doctrine which Puritans held in abhorrence? Clearly not. Puritans were not slow to point out what they regarded as blemishes. Can any example be found of any eminent Puritan Divine who charged the Church Catechism with teaching the doctrine of Luther?

Nonconformists I believe now, some of them at least, are not slow to condemn this answer in our Catechism. But is there any one instance to be shown of any Nonconformist theologian of learning and authority, uttering one word of objection to this, for many years after it was published and set forth?

How are we to account for the absence of all condemnation or censure of this answer from Puritan Divines of note and esteem? How comes it, that the loud cry of complaint is hushed before these words of our Catechism, or taken up by some few and feeble voices, which serve only to make more striking the general silence?

In the year 1606, was published a book entitled "A Survey of the Book of Common Prayer." To this book there are frequent references made in Bishop Cosin's first series of notes on the Prayer Book, which has commonly passed under the name of Overall. This is said to be "apparently one of the most systematic and authoritative collections of the objections of the Puritans." But in this there is no exception taken to this answer in the Catechism.

When the Dissentients at Conference at Savoy, in 1662, sent in their long paper of grievances, and going through the whole Prayer Book, laid their fingers on every word and expression in which they thought might be found a blot — how is it to be accounted for, that while commenting freely on the Catechism, and passing under review its several parts, the answer which contains the teaching which is alleged to be the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, is passed by without one word of objection, without one syllable of criticism, without so much as a suggestion that the words might be more cautiously expressed, without even a whisper that it might be framed more to their mind? And yet, if they had seen lurking here but the trace of the doctrine of the Real or Corporal Presence, all their other objections, even the whole sum of all their matters of complaint, would have sank into insignificance beside it. Did then the Puritan Divines pay no particular regard to the Catechism? They sent in six exceptions to it. Is it possible then that they did not have under their eye the part added at the Hampton Court Conference? Three of the answers from this part are set down by them for amendment. But not one of the answers which teach the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is noticed or referred to in any way. How is this to be accounted for?

This is a fact to which I must be allowed to direct very special attention. Let it be permitted to me to say without offence to any, that it is surely a matter worthy of the very calm and serious consideration of all, who, from whatever point of view, have been in the habit of regarding this answer as having something of a "Real Objective" look— as not sounding quite like the pure language of the Reformed; that at the Savoy there was actually nothing

hinted concerning any amendment, of which, in the view of the Puritans, this answer might be capable.

At a time when the Dissentients were called upon by their principles, and prompted by their feelings, and required by a great occasion, to point out all the blemishes they could, and multiply objections to the uttermost, and find fault wherever fault could be found—no objection was made to this answer, and no fault was found with the teaching of the Catechism concerning the Lord's Supper.

Here the Puritans did not ask for one word to be altered, did not desire one phrase to be amended.

This answer in the Catechism has passed their scrutiny unchallenged. It has stood the fire of their severest criticism, and has come out without a hair singed. *The keen piercing eye of the most searching Puritan inspection has been upon it, and we have it on record, that there* WAS FOUND IN IT NOT A FLAW.

And how, I ask, is this to be accounted for?

It is utterly unaccountable, I believe, on the supposition of this answer speaking the language or containing the doctrine of those who held the Eucharistic opinions of Luther. And how, I ask, is all this to be accounted for? It can only be accounted for in one way, and that is, by the fact that this addition to the Catechism was neither intended nor understood to teach any such doctrine. And thus we are led to our second point, which is:—

II. That the Catechism uses no language on this subject but what is the language common to all the Reformed Protestants of that day.

By "that day" I mean to include a whole century, indeed more than fifty years before that date, and more than full

fifty years after. I mean it to go back to take in the Reformation period of King Edward's reign, and to go forward to the date of the Conference of Savoy, and final settlement of our formularies.

And of this period, I think, it may be confidently asserted, and satisfactorily shewn, that there is nothing whatever taught in the Catechism, which may not be matched (1) in the writings of our English Reformers, (2) in the Confessions of faith of other Reformed Churches, (3) in the declarations of Puritan Divines.

(1) To take first the case of our English Reformers. Mr. Sedley Taylor has made such a careful and well-chosen selection of a few brief passages from their writings, that (though very many more might be added) I cannot do better than quote from his pamphlet, what I may call the cream of his extracts, asking my readers to bear carefully in mind that the writers have all borne witness to their repudiation of the Real Objective Presence.

([1]) "Take then this lesson . . . that thou look up with faith upon the *holy body and blood* . . . . thou *receive* it . . . . and thou *take* it fully." (Homily on worthy receiving of the Sacrament, Part I.—quoting from Emissenus.)

([2]) "He (Christ) . . . feedeth . . . with His own flesh . . . and giveth . . . drink of the blood flowing out of His own side." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, P.S. Edit., p. 7.)

([3]) "He giveth His own flesh spiritually to feed upon, and His own blood to quench their great inward thirst." (Ibid p. 34.)

([4]) "As the bread is outwardly eaten indeed in the Lord's Supper, so is the very *body* of Christ inwardly eaten *indeed*

of all them that come thereto in such sort as they ought to do." (Ibid p. 35.)

(5) Christ "is spiritually *eaten* . . . and yet this is '*really*,' that is to say in deed and effectually." (Ibid, p. 71.)

(6) "I believe that . . . . we do verily and indeed receive His body and blood." (Hooper, ii., pp. 48, 49.)

"The faithful may otherwise eat Christ's body, and that *verily and indeed*, and not only in the Sacrament." (Jewel, Sermon and Harding, p. 450.)

Taking these together, Mr. Taylor excellently observes, "We find the following expressions:

take . . . receive . . . body and blood. (1)
very body . . . eaten indeed. (4)
eat . . . Christ's body . . . verily and indeed. (7)
verily and indeed receive His body and blood. (6)

Compare these with the paragraph of the Catechism, 'The Body and Blood of Christ are *verily and indeed taken and received* in the Lord's Supper,' and it will be seen that every single expression used in it is to be found in the passages just examined."

(2) In the Confessions of faith of other Reformed Churches it may not be possible (as it could hardly be expected) to find such an actual identity of expressions; but it will not be difficult to find, at least a real and true identity of teaching.

(*a*) We will turn first to the latter Confession of Helvetia 1566—written by the pastors of Zurich (Bullinger being the most prominent) "and approved and subscribed not only by the Tigurines (inhabitants of Zurich) themselves, and

their confederates of Berne, Schaffhausen, Sangalia, Rhetia, Mulhausen and Bienne; but by the Churches of Geneva, of Savoy, of Poland, and likewise of Hungary, and of Scotland."

This is that Confession of which we have seen Grindall writing to Bullinger that we most fully agree with it. Nothing can well be clearer than its repudiation of anything like the Real Objective Presence and the doctrine of the Lutherans on the Lord's Supper, of which evidence may be seen above in our third Paper, p. 167, note. The following extracts are made from the English translation as given in Mr. Hall's "Harmony of Protestant Confessions."

"The Lord by this sacred rite . . . doth now *feed* us with His *flesh*, and giveth us His *blood* to drink. . . . . By this holy Supper . . . . *the faithful* . . . . *receive* . . . . the flesh and blood of the Lord, and do feed on them to life everlasting." (Pages 316-7.)

"By spiritual meat we mean not any imaginary thing, but the *very body* of our Lord Jesus, *given* to us; which . . . . is *received* of the faithful . . . . by faith." (Page 318.)

(*b*) Secondly, we will turn to the former Confession of Helvetia.

It was "written at Basle, about the year 1536, in behalf of all the churches of Helvetia, and sent and presented to the assembly of divines at Wirtemburg," by Bucer and Capito.

The following passages are quoted, as before, from Hall's Harmony.

"We do indeed eat the body, and we do indeed drink the blood, of our Lord." (Page 322.)

"These holy gifts of God are represented unto us by visible signs, to wit, bread and wine . . . . here we must think upon greater things, to wit, not of eating bread, or drinking wine, but of *receiving* the Lord Himself, with all His gifts, by a faithful mind." (Page 322.)

"It is most evident, that in the Holy Supper we do not take away our Lord Christ from His church, nor deny *that His body and blood is there received* to be our nourishment unto life eternal." (Page 323.)

(*c*) The Confession of Basle was first written in German, about 1532. But in 1561 it was again recognised and received by the ministers of Basle. It is sometimes called the Confession of Mulhausen. The following brief extract is to our purpose:—

"In the Supper of the Lord . . . we firmly believe . . . that our souls, by faith in Christ crucified, are fed and moistened with the flesh and blood of Christ." (Page 325.)

(*d*) The Confession of France was first presented to Francis the Second, in 1559; again in 1561, to Charles the Ninth; and in 1566 was published in Latin, by the Pastors of the French churches, with a preface to all other evangelical pastors.

In this Confession we have under Article 36, the following statement:

"We affirm that the Holy Supper of the Lord . . . . is a witness to us of our uniting with our Lord Jesus Christ; because that He . . . . *doth indeed feed us* and nourish us *with His flesh and blood*. . . . . We believe that . . . . he doth nourish and quicken us *with the substance* of His body

and blood, *apprehended by faith.*" (Hall's Harmony, p. 330.)

And again, under Article 37, "We believe . . . that God doth *indeed*, that is truly and effectually, give whatsoever he doth there sacramentally represent: and accordingly with the signs we join the true *possession* and *fruition* of *that* thing, which is there offered unto us. Therefore we affirm, that they which do bring pure faith, as it were a certain vessel, unto the Holy Supper of the Lord, do *indeed receive that* which there the signs do witness; namely, that the *body and blood of Jesus Christ* are no less *the meat and drink of the* soul, than bread and wine are the meat of the body." (Hall's Harmony, p. 331.)

(*e*) Next we take from the Confession of Scotland, composed by Knox (allowed by Parliament, 1560, ratified 1567, and subscribed by the King, 1581,) the following passage, "As the Eternal Godhead giveth to the flesh of Christ Jesus . . . life and immortality; so doth Christ Jesus *His flesh and blood, eaten and drunken by us*, give unto us the same prerogatives." (Hall's Harmony, p. 335.)

(*f*) Lastly, we appeal to the Belgian Confession, published in the name of all the churches of Belgia, 1566, and confirmed in public Synod, 1579. Here it is declared, "He testifieth, that as *truly* as we do *receive* and *hold in our hands* this sign, eating the same with our mouths . . . so *truly* we *do by faith* (which is to our soul instead of hand and mouth) *receive* the *very body* and *true blood* of Christ . . . Neither shall we err in saying, that that which is eaten is

the very natural body of Christ, and that that which is drunk is the very blood of Christ. . . . Christ is *communicated* to the *faithful* ONLY." (Hall's Harmony, pp. 336, 337).

With these may be compared the following from the Irish Articles of 1615: "In the outward part of the Holy Communion, the body and blood of Christ is in a most lively manner represented, being no otherwise present with the visible elements than things signified and sealed are present with the signs and seals; that is to say, symbolically and relatively. But in the inward and spiritual part, the *same body and blood* is REALLY and SUBSTANTIALLY *presented unto all* those who have grace to receive the Son of God, even to all those that believe in His name." (See Neal's History of Puritans, vol. iii., p. 517.)

It seems needless to stay to point out the agreement of these Confessions (drawn up by those who entirely repudiated the Corporal Presence,) with the answer in the Catechism.

There is nothing which can be drawn out from the teaching of the Catechism, or fairly fastened on to its expressions, which is not clearly taught in these Confessions of faith.

They all unite in bearing witness to the truth, that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.

(3) It remains to make good our assertion concerning the agreement also in this teaching of our English Puritans.

For this purpose we cannot do better than appeal to

"The humble advice of the Assembly of Divines by authority of Parliament sitting at Westminster, concerning a Confession of Faith . . . presented by them . . . to both Houses of Parliament."

This contains (1) The Westminster Confession of Faith, and (2) The larger, and (3) The shorter Catechism. I quote from an edition of 1658.

"Worthy Receivers outwardly partaking of the visible elements, in this sacrament, do then also inwardly *by faith*, REALLY and INDEED . . . *receive* and *feed upon Christ Crucified*, and all the benefits of His death: The *body and blood of Christ being* then . . . as really . . . present to the Faith of Believers in that ordinance, as elements themselves are to their outward senses." (Confession, chap. xxix. 7, pp. 99, 100.)

"Q. *What is the Lord's Supper?*

A. The Lord's Supper is a Sacrament of the New Testament, wherein . . . . they that worthily communicate, *feed upon His body and blood*. . . ." (Larger Catechism, p. 131.)

"The body and blood of Christ . . . . are . . . . *present* to the faith of the receiver, NO LESS TRULY AND REALLY than the elements themselves are to their outward senses; so they that worthily communicate in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, do therein *feed* upon the body and blood of Christ . . . . TRULY AND REALLY, while by faith they receive and apply unto themselves Christ Crucified, and all the benefits of His death." (Larger Catechism, p. 132.)

"Q. *What is the Lord's Supper?*

A. The Lord's Supper is a Sacrament, wherein, by giving and receiving Bread and Wine according to Christ's appointment, His death is shewed forth; and the worthy receivers are, not after a corporal and carnal manner, but by *faith*, made PARTAKERS OF HIS BODY AND BLOOD, with all His benefits to their spiritual nourishment, and growth in grace." (Shorter Catechism, pp. 35, 36.)

None, I imagine, will maintain that the Assembly of Divines taught, or meant to teach, the Real Objective Presence; yet to judge from their actual words, it seems to me, that they taught and meant to teach it neither more nor less, but, just as much as the Church of England taught or meant to teach it in the words so often, for that purpose, quoted from her Catechism.

But then shall we come to the conclusion, that all Divines, English and Foreign, Conformist and Puritan, had conspired together at that time, to use language unsuitable to the subject, language which we do right now to pronounce mistaken and misleading?

I trust we may not come to any such conclusion, and therefore, I desire to show:

III. That this language is the proper language to express the views of those who deny the Real Objective Presence.

If it be not the proper language on the subject, wherein is its impropriety?

(1) Is it that this language teaches of a participation of Christ's body and blood?

And is it a part then (I speak as in the name of the

Reformed)—is it, I ask, a part of our faith to believe, that when St. Paul has taught us that the bread broken and the cup blessed is the communion of the body and blood of Christ, there is in the Lord's Supper no communion and no participation of that body and blood?

Is a part of our opinion, that whereas, our Lord Himself has taught that without participation of His flesh and blood we can have no true life in our souls—we should renounce all participation of that flesh and blood in the very sacrament consecrated by His Word, saying, "This my body, This is my blood"—and leave such participation to be, not the exclusive *claim* only, but the exclusive possession of those, whom we regard as being in error in this matter?

Is this, I ask, a part of our faith? And I am sure I may take an answer from all true sons and daughters of the Reformed Church of England—"God Forbid!"

(2) Is the impropriety then in the teaching of the *reality* and *verity* of this participation?

But our Reformers taught that *our* participation, the participation of our souls *by faith*, is the real and true, the *only* true and real participation of Christ's body and blood. And what participation is that which we would have without its verity and reality?

And what did our Lord mean, when teaching of the necessity of that participation, He added that solemn emphasis in those words which He said before, "Verily, Verily," "Amen, Amen"? Listen again to His saying:—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." There is a terrible reality and verity in the soul's great need, in the soul's great hunger. There is a "verily" in the telling, by Him who is the Truth, of the necessity of

our being partakers of His Body, given for the life of the world. And shall there be no verity, no truth and reality, no "verily and indeed" in the making good of His Word, who saith, "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed"? Shall we be taught, "verily and indeed" to know our great want, the absolute necessity of our being made partakers of the crucified body and blood of Christ; and then be offended at being taught to know that the body and blood of Christ are "*verily and indeed*" taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper? Let every Christian heart answer again—"God Forbid."

(3) Is the impropriety then in the expressing of this true participation by the words, "taken and received"? But is it not right that faith should be taught to know and exercise her true office of taking, and receiving, and feeding on the gift of God? To think that this taking and receiving, viewed in connexion with the words of the Article, "given, taken, and received," speak of a giving by the hand of the priest, and a taking and receiving with the hand and the mouth of our body, is utterly to mistake the meaning of the words, and to fasten on them a sense which they cannot fairly bear. To know something of the language of our Reformers, is to know that such a sense they would not have dreamt of. To view this language through the teaching of the Reformation, is to see that our Reformers would never have accepted such an interpretation. The language of the Catechism is in perfect harmony with their language. They spoke and taught, as the Catechism speaks and teaches, of taking and receiving. But their taking and receiving belong to the actions, and the working, not of the body, but of the soul. In their view of the Lord's Supper, not the elements only, but the whole circumstances of the ordi-

nance bear a certain sacramental and spiritual signification. Something in the same way as in baptism, not "the outward visible sign" only, but the "form" of going down to the washing and rising again from the water, have their spiritual counterpart, not only in the washing of the soul in Christ's blood, but also in the soul's going down to be buried with Christ and to rise again with Him—Baptism, representing to us our profession, that as Christ died and rose, so should we also, being buried with Christ by baptism into death, reckon ourselves dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord —something in the same way, the matter stands with the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in the view of our Reformers and their successors. They see in it, not only the reality represented by the visible element; not only the reality for the soul in the body and blood of Christ, by which the soul is to be strengthened and refreshed, as the body by the bread and wine; and not only in the breaking of the bread, and pouring out of the wine, do they see a sacramental action, with a sacramental signification, even a showing forth of the Lord's death; but they regard the body and blood of Christ as *given* to the soul's faith, even as the bread and wine are *given* to the body;—*given* to the soul by a present Saviour, a Saviour seen by the eye of faith; even as the bread and wine are given to the body by a present minister, a minister seen by the eye of the body; and they regard the believer's soul as doing by faith just what the body does when it takes the elements in its hand; they see in the soul the hand of faith stretched out to take, and the mouth of faith ready to receive; even as the mouth of the body receives the visible element, even so faith, the soul's mouth, receiving verily and indeed that which is signified and sealed by the bread and wine outwardly re-

ceived according to Christ's institution. Yes, the soul thus receiving verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ, that the believer may feed on Him in His heart by faith with thanksgiving.

This giving, taking, and receiving is all inward and spiritual, though having their exact counterpart in actions outward and visible.

This giving, taking, and receiving pertains entirely to the soul. It is only and entirely "after a heavenly and spiritual manner." It is in every part and particular belonging to the invisible. It is a giving to the soul, and a receiving by the soul. And this none the less, because it is pictured and represented by, and not only so, but bound up by Christ's institution and blessing, with the visible taking and receiving of that visible thing, which signifies and seals the invisible gift to the soul.

In this giving, taking and receiving, the Giver is no priest that stands before any altar on earth. It is God Himself, not a mortal man, Who, in our duly receiving these holy mysteries or signs, vouchsafes to feed us with the true spiritual food of our soul. The Giver may indeed be said to be the One Eternal Priest. It is He whom faith only sees, but whom faith sees indeed, as a present, personal Saviour. And the taking is the work of no outstretched hand of the body, and the receiving is the opening of no bodily lips. No! but the taking is not less real, when the soul which is labouring, not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto eternal life, and which it knows the Son of man will give; when the soul which knows its need of a Saviour, knows its need of being made partaker of the sacrifice of His death—draws near, not merely with a bodily approach to the Lord's table, but draws near

with faith to the very Lord of the table, whose voice is heard speaking those comfortable words to its great need, "Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest;" and draws near to receive, with the full assurance of faith—to receive, not from the bread and wine, not from the minister, but with bread and wine, and with the receipt of that food for the body from the minister's hand, to receive from Christ Himself all that is needed to make good to the soul the full and blessed meaning of His own words:—"He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day."

(4) But it will be said, perhaps, that every other objection being removed, it can hardly be proper language to express the view of those who deny the corporal presence,—to say that what is received is *the body and blood of Christ*.

The objection would seem to take something of this form:—"It might be suitable language for you to say that you receive the benefits purchased by the sacrifice of Christ's body and the shedding of His blood. But in the Catechism you say *not this*, but that you receive verily and indeed the body and blood of Christ themselves."

But Hooker speaks of it as universally confessed to be most true that "the efficacy of His body and blood is *not all* we receive in this Sacrament." And for myself I feel in a manner bound to enter something like a protest against such a use of language as would seem to surrender THE REALITY *of the reception by faith of* THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST *themselves*, because the language which tells of that reality has been perverted by some to a sense we repudiate.

I know, indeed, that the objection which I am dealing with, is one which is felt sometimes as a difficulty by not a

few who would desire to take their stand firmly and strongly on the side of the Reformers. They feel afraid of the language which for considerably more than a hundred years, was the language on the subject, I might almost say, of universal Protestantism; and regard it as not sufficiently guarded and accurate.

They shrink from its use because they fear its abuse.

They think the true teaching (the teaching really meant) might be more correctly expressed by such words as, "the Blessings purchased by Christ Body and Blood are verily and indeed taken and received."

But such persons, may, in all lovingkindness be asked to consider well, whether the language of the Catechism is not more scriptural. And if more scriptural, must it not, therefore, be more proper language to express *our* views, who take Scripture as our Rule of faith?

Is it not wise—is it not right that our formularies should bear witness for us, that "our Church believes" (to use the language of Archbishop Secker) "the strongest assertions of Scripture concerning this Sacrament"?

But, further, I would venture to ask such persons as prefer to speak of receiving the benefits, instead of receiving the *thing* from which the benefits come,—Do you mean to express the receiving of some portion of the benefits cut off and dissociated from THE THING? You will answer, "No," for you know well that what is needed and what is offered is the full and entire possession of *all* the benefits, and that they cannot be really sundered or severed from the THE THING. Then allow me to say that you mean by the possession of the benefits—the VERY BENEFICIAL POSSESSION OF THE THING: You mean by receiving the benefit—a receiving of the ACTUAL POSSESSION of THE THING for ALL

PURPOSES *for which you can possibly* NEED IT OR USE IT OR ENJOY IT. And that which makes it the most proper language to speak of the receiving and possessing THE THING, is not only, I conceive, that it is most scriptural, but also that hereby are taught two very important truths, and hereby are excluded two pernicious mistakes. (1) The first error thus excluded, is the error of thinking that there may be some limitation to the benefits which the soul may thus be partaker of. For the truth taught here seems to say "Open thy mouth wide and it shall be filled, for here is no mere giving you of any fixed and circumscribed amount of blessing, that you should be able to believe that this much and that much are yours; but here is the giving to you—making over to your faith *the very crucified* BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST—that you may be able to say, 'CHRIST DIED FOR ME,' that so, *with that*, you may be able to say, 'All things are mine.' And, therefore, any straitening or limiting the blessing you receive, can never come from any straitening or limiting of that, which, in its power to bless, you receive. It can only come from the straitening of your own soul's apprehension. Therefore, let thy soul open its mouth wide, for it cannot desire, or ask for, or expect, or believe, too much."

(2) And the second error thus excluded, is the error of thinking that there can be any sundering of the *benefits* from THE THING, that the *benefits* can come to us any otherwise than from *that* THING—that we ever can receive, or ought to believe that we receive the *benefits*, without being truly made *beneficially partakers of* THE THING—that we may believe that we are justified, without believing in Christ and His atonement—that we may believe that we have received adoption, without believing that *Christ died*

for us—believe that we are partakers of *life* without believing that we are partakers of *Christ's death*, believe that we receive what Christ died *to give us* without believing that our faith does indeed beneficially receive, for this very purpose, that very flesh which was crucified for us.

Indeed I believe that the force of the objection I am dealing with, would be altogether broken, if it were well considered that there is no such thing as a possibility of our being made partakers of the *benefits* or *efficacy* of *Christ's sacrifice* without being made beneficially partakers of the *very sacrifice itself*. No possibility of receiving the *blessings purchased* by Christ's body and blood without, in some sense, receiving *verily and indeed that very* BODY AND BLOOD.

If our souls are washed and made white, they are washed and made white *only* in the blood of the Lamb. There is no separating the washing from the blood. And in like manner, if our souls are fed, and nourished, and refreshed, by receiving the justification and adoption which come of Christ's atoning death, they must be nourished, and refreshed, and strengthened, by feeding on Christ's *crucified* BODY AND BLOOD. There is no separating the feeding from the sacrifice; no separating the receiving from the body and blood of Christ. Christ and Christ's atoning sacrifice, and Christ's salvation can never be sundered, so that one should be received without the other. Christ's Sacraments may by unbelief, be sundered from all these. Christ's Sacraments may be received without any one of these. But not one of these can be received alone. He that would be *partaker* of the *everlasting life* which Christ gives, must be *partaker* of the *flesh and blood* which CHRIST *gave* and still gives. He that would be partaker of that *flesh and blood*, to feed his soul withal, can be partaker thereof only by coming to HIM,

who says, "He that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.

Our redemption and its blessed fruits; the ransom price and the liberty of the ransomed souls: these things should ever be viewed in their inseparable connexion. CHRIST'S WORK and CHRIST'S GRACE *can never be sundered in fact, and should never be sundered in faith.* THEY CAN NEVER BE SUNDERED IN FACT, *i. e.*, as effect can have no existence except as derived from its sole cause. "We have redemption, even the forgiveness of sins," but we have it and can have it only "through His blood." But for that death and blood-shedding we could not have it. Apart from, *i. e.*, except as coming from, that death and blood-shedding, still we cannot have it. THEY SHOULD NEVER BE SUNDERED IN FAITH, for faith is taught by God's Spirit, who testifies of Christ, and taking of the things of Christ reveals to us Christ's peace; but reveals it only as "made by the *blood* of His cross." And thus faith learns how condemned sinners can only be "reconciled to God by the *death* of His Son."

If I would be justified, I must be justified by faith, and that faith should not only believe *justification*, but believe in HIM, who *died* for my sins and rose again for my *justification*.

If I would *live*, I must live by the faith of the Son of God. If I would live by the faith of the Son of God, it must be by the faith of Him "who loved me and gave Himself for me." And for my faith to believe that He LOVED ME AND GAVE HIMSELF FOR ME, *is* just, *in other words*, to believe that HIS SACRIFICED BODY AND BLOOD are MINE; that I am in *beneficial possession* of them; that they were given for me. And for this faith and this possession, my soul must receive the gift from Him who says, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink." This—the *believing indeed that* CHRIST *died*

and shed His precious blood FOR ME; this—the very *making Him and His sacrifice my own*, by simply taking them from Himself the Giver—this is the *taking*, and *receiving*, and *feeding on* the VERY BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST.

And our faith is to be taught this; in other words, our faith is to be taught, not only to receive the forgiveness of sins; not only to embrace and hold fast the blessed hope of everlasting life; but our faith is to be taught, that if this remission is to be ours, if this life is to be ours; CHRIST *must be* OURS; CHRIST'S SACRIFICE *must be* OURS; CHRIST'S DEATH *must be* OURS. The believer is to be taught to say, "If Christ had not died for me, I must have perished; if Christ did not die for me, I can never have pardon and peace. If I would have pardon and peace, I must know that Christ died for me; I must know that His death and His atonement are mine and for me; I must know that HIS CRUCIFIED BODY AND BLOOD are MINE *and* FOR ME; I must have that CRUCIFIED BODY AND BLOOD *made* MINE, that I may know it was FOR ME; *they must be* TRULY GIVEN to me, and I must *receive them*, that I may know that they are MINE; know that they are FOR ME. And when I see how Christ has appointed these seals of all that I require, saying, 'This is my body,' 'this is my blood,' I see how He has herein met the need of my soul; and in faith receiving these, I know that I receive from Him the very gift they seal and signify to my soul. *Now I know that* CHRIST'S DEATH AND ATONEMENT ARE MINE. I take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died *for me*, and so I feed on Him in my heart by faith with thanksgiving."

And this truth of the inseparable connection of the gift of our justification with the atonement of Christ; of our life with His death; and of the being made partakers of

life, only by being made partakers of His death ; and of the receiving of the strengthening and refreshing of our souls *only by receiving the* BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST ;—as it is taught plainly in our Lord's own words : "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you" ; so is it also (as I think) taught in the words of our Catechism : "The body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

And let it not be said, "Then for this giving and receiving you must needs make Christ's body and blood to be really *there* in *the elements.*"

No. Here is no making the sacrifice of Christ to be *present* on the *altar.* But rather ; here, in and through the memorial exhibition of that sacrifice, the faith of the believer is taken to be present as on the very day of the crucifixion, at that One Sacrifice once offered on the Cross, to know that Saviour, that Sacrifice, that atoning death, that blood shedding, all its own—and to have it so made over to it, in receiving Christ's own seals of conveyance that it may say, "All this is mine and for me." Can you not really give a large possession locally absent by saying to another of that absent possession, "I have had it fenced off and prepared and tilled on purpose for you ; I give it you ;—It shall be yours this minute if you will accept it;—Here is the plan representing the estate ;—Here is my deed of conveyance ;—Here are its seals, and signatures" ? And can not the other that minute take and receive the possession by saying, "I accept it most thankfully," and taking at once into his hand the seals and effectual tokens of deliverance ?

Such a similitude of course fails to represent the full truth of the giving, and taking, and receiving, which we have before us.

Every such picture must of course, fall short of expressing what needs to be expressed, and representing what it should represent.

It fails entirely to express how the receipt of that *absent* gift becomes immediately the *present* food for the soul's hunger, and the very cup of salvation for the soul's thirst.

It fails, too, to represent how in this *taking and receiving* we are verily and indeed made to be one with Christ and Christ with us.

How can any earthly similitude picture aright the heavenly and spiritual reality?

Still such an illustration may help to remove the difficulties which some now feel in this matter, and to justify to all the propriety of that language which speaks of giving, taking, and receiving of Christ's body, though that body be not present in the elements; the "giving, taking, and receiving" telling of a such very real beneficial possession of that which is locally absent, that it fully suffices for all the soul's deep necessities; suffices for it so to receive the gift of that body crucified, and that blood shed for it, that it may feed on it with the soul's true feeding, and be strengthened and refreshed by the body and blood of Christ as the body is by the bread and wine.

Faith wants the VERY REALITY *of the* CRUCIFIED BODY OF CHRIST *to feed upon*. It is a mistake to think that because the giving, taking, and receiving are all only after a spiritual and heavenly manner, that therefore the thing given to faith, and the thing received by faith, cannot be that *very* THING of which Christ says, "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."

The faith that thirsts is to be taught to go to drink of the water of life from the very fountain head, from the very smitten Rock.

Our soul's true hunger is to be taught to feed on that flesh which is meat indeed, by believing that in that flesh, HE was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities. It is flesh, even the very flesh and blood of the Son of God, which has redeemed the world.

He took that very flesh and blood on purpose that He might give them for the life of the world. And there is now no life for the world, no life for our souls, but by being partakers of that Redeeming Gift. To be partakers of the life we must be partakers of the Redemption, and to be partakers of the Great Redemption is to be beneficially partakers of the very redeeming price; or in other words, to take and receive the Redemption of Christ which He has wrought out and purchased by His crucified body and blood, is verily and indeed to take and receive the sacrificed body and blood of Christ. It is to take and receive them verily and indeed for Redemption purposes, that is, for the very purposes for which they were given.

And thus to take and receive them for redemption purposes, that is, to believe in that flesh and blood as given and shed for our soul's peace, is to satisfy the soul's true hunger, by feeding on the soul's true meat.

This is, indeed, to eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood. This is to dwell in Christ and Christ in us. And thus it is that our souls are strengthened and refreshed by the body and blood of Christ as our bodies are by the bread and wine.

It may be said, perhaps, that, after all, the difference may be reduced to very little more than a question of words. True; but, for a question of words, it is one of no small importance, for it involves just THIS question, whether our doctrine does indeed fulfil the requirements of the language of Scripture, and of the declarations of our blessed Saviour.

If it does not so, then let us condemn the language of our Catechism as unsuitable to our doctrine, because our doctrine falls short of what the Scripture plainly teaches.

But if, on the contrary, we are persuaded that our doctrine does truly answer to the words of Christ's teaching, then let us not fear to express it in language, which shall come up to the level of His language.

To shrink from such words, because Papists might use them, and Lutherans might lay claim to them, is too much like conceding, that to teach the doctrine of Papists and Lutherans concerning the Real Presence, is the only way to teach men's hearts to speak as Christ spake, and use such language as He used.

It is right indeed, that, as occasion requires, we should guard such language by teaching, as our Church teaches, very plainly that, "the giving and receiving," is "ONLY after a heavenly and spiritual manner," and that it is by faith, and faith *only*, that there can be any receiving or eating at all. But this ought not to be allowed to detract from the truth that spiritual taking and receiving, is taking and receiving *verily* and *indeed*, and that this eating by faith is the *true* and the ONLY *true* eating of that *very* body which was crucified, and that *very* blood which was shed for the life of the world.

It would be out of place to enter more fully and exactly into this subject here. I am only concerned at present, with showing (as I trust I have sufficiently done) that the language of the Catechism is the proper language to express the views of those who deny the Corporal Presence.

IV. It only remains for me now to make good the assertion that the language of the Catechism is repugnant to the views of those who hold the "Real Objective Presence."

It would indeed be quite sufficient for our purpose to show that there is nothing here but what belongs to our own teaching—for it would be unreasonable to expect in a Catechism for children, that every answer should be so full and definite as to exclude every error. But yet we may be thankful that in the answer before us there is that which must exclude the error we are now concerned with.

The language of the Catechism, cannot indeed, possibly be reconciled with the views of our opponents, without forcing on the word "faithful" a sense which cannot be allowed.

For unless the word "faithful" be here introduced with no meaning and for no purpose, unless it be mere verbiage in a formula, which in its nature requires brevity, and excludes needless expressions, it must be intended to exclude from participation, those who are not included in its meaning.

Therefore, since the Ritualists believe that the body and blood of Christ are received by wicked persons, void of a lively faith, a laboured effort is made to make the word "faithful" here mean "all baptized members of the Church."

It is confessed on all sides, that by "the faithful" is many times meant the whole body of the professing christians, and that thus there are two senses of the word "faithful;" *one*, in which it means "all who call themselves christians;" *the other*, in which it signifies "those who have a true and living faith."

The first is called the strict theological sense; the other the loose and incorrect sense.

By an inversion, I would take the liberty rather to call *that*, the true, correct, theological sense, in which the word stands for those who live by faith; and *that*, the loose and allowable sense, in which it signifies all who profess the name of Christ in His Church.

But name these two senses as we may, *this* we must maintain, that here in the Catechism it has what I call its strict and correct sense—the sense of truly believing Christians. Are we to interpret this word as it stands here, without any reference to the analogy of the other Sacrament, of which the Catechism has just taught us that for its reception is required "faith, whereby we *stedfastly believe* the promises of God made to us in that Sacrament?"

Are we to interpret it without any relation to the answer which comes immediately after, and teaches concerning this same Sacrament, that it is required of those who come to it "to examine themselves whether they have a *lively faith* in God's mercy through Christ?"

Are we altogether forbidden in our interpretation of these words to take into view previous catechetical formulæ of the Church, the Greater and the Lesser Catechisms of Nowell, the use of which enjoined in Canon 79; and of which, the latter seems to have supplied the basis of the answer before us, in a somewhat longer answer, wherein the word "*faithful*" is used as the beginning, and is explained by "*those who trust in Him*," towards the end?

Is the expression in *this* formulary (intended primarily for the use of young children) to be interpreted without any reference to the words of our Communion Service (intended for communicants) "if with a true penitent heart and *lively* faith we receive that holy sacrament . . . *then* we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood"? Or is it unallowable, in its interpretation, to refer to our Articles (intended for Divines), one of which, teaching with theological accuracy the very same doctrine as that of the answer before us, declares that "to such as *rightly, worthily and* WITH FAITH, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ"; and to make the

matter still more clear, teaches also that "the *mean* whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is *Faith*"; and another of which (as if further to remove all possibility of question) pronounces that "the wicked, and such as be *void* of a *lively faith*" in the use of the sacrament, are *in no wise* "partakers of Christ"?

Surely if the language of our Catechism fairly admitted of a question, it were but right and reasonable to look to our Articles for a resolution of the question.

But of these Articles we shall have to treat in a future Paper. It must suffice now to say, that the universal language of English reformed theology on this subject, altogether excludes (as I believe) any other than the strict meaning of the word "faithful" here. For however admissible another sense might be for the same word standing in another place and another relation, where it might naturally admit of such a looser interpretation, the subject to which it is applied necessarily fixes its meaning in this answer.

We know well, how in common things the same word has a sense fixed on it, by the relation in which it stands. We speak of "a *fine* day," "a *fine* prospect," and "a *fine* piece of silk." In each saying we use the same word, depending in each case on its having a separate meaning stamped on it by the subject on which we speak; and we do not think it necessary in either case to explain what sense the word bears in the one saying or the other. The relation in which it stands here is enough. So with the word "faithful." The relation in which it stands here is enough. As applied to *Eucharistic reception* it needs no explaining. It *constantly means the same.*

This fixed sense of the word "*faithful*" (in this connexion) arose, no doubt, from what may be called the necessities of the Eucharistic controversy; which entered much into the

office of *faith*, and led naturally to the drawing of a clear line of distinction between those who had and those who had not "a lively *faith* in God's mercy through Christ." From this arose the constant use of such expressions as "worthy receivers." And from this it was almost the necessary result, that, as applied to the doctrinal teaching concerning the Lord's Supper and its reception, the word "*faithful*" (in the theological language of the English Reformed Church) came to have its meaning as clearly marked and defined, by the very fact of its standing in such connexion as any word in common use, which, being capable of two senses, is capable (ordinarily and naturally) of one only, when used in one connexion.

Curious eccentricities of language will sometimes come up: and possibly some example may be found of an exceptional use of this word. Though I think I may say, with some confidence, that I never met with one. But if found, it can only be regarded as an eccentricity, and can never avail to affect the meaning of the word, as thus used, in an authorised formulary of our Church.

There is no fear of "*fine*," when applied to *silk*, being understood as equivalent to *not wet*, though it would mean *that*, applied to the weather. Its meaning is not doubtful because it is spoken of *silk*. So of "faithful" here. Its meaning is not doubtful, because it is spoken of Eucharistic reception. I will venture to ask Mr. Cobb, or Mr. Grueber, or any one who maintains the contrary, to bring forward any one passage from any one approved divine of the English Reformed Church, taking in fifty years before and fifty years after the date of this addition to the Catechism,—to bring forward, I say, any one passage where the word "*faithful*" is thus applied to the subject of Eucharistic Reception, and can be shown clearly to bear the sense now claimed for

it here. Doubtless, to say this may seem very bold, perhaps even, very presumptuous. Of course, I should not say it, if I were not strongly convinced that fair investigation of this subject will tend to confirm my position. If, however, I am wrong, let me be shewn to be wrong. I hope I shall be found quite ready to acknowledge my error, so far as I may be convicted of error; and to correct any false impression, so far my words may have conveyed any impression not strictly true.

I must not, however, be misunderstood. I will not be so rash as to deny positively that any such example can exist. I will not be so presumptuous as to affirm that no passage can possibly be brought forward with Mr. Cobb's meaning.

But I do express a firm conviction that whatever may be alleged in support of the other sense, must weigh *very light indeed* against the *enormous preponderance* of passages which will support the strict sense of "*faithful.*"

Sure I am, that if Mr. Cobb enters carefully on the investigation, he will soon find himself surrounded by innumerable passages which can clearly bear only the strict sense. And I will be bold enough to express a very full persuasion, that if any passage should be found bearing the other sense, it will be so like a sort of "*lusus naturæ,*" so like a black swan among its snow white fellows, that it could scarcely be truly and fairly regarded otherwise, than as an exception which must prove the rule.

But if this be so, then my position is made good; for the Catechism clearly limits participation to the "faithful," and the maintainers of the Real Objective Presence teach plainly, that those who thus limit the reception of the res sacramenti to *faith*, and *those who have faith*, are altogether falling short of the true doctrine of the Eucharist.

No. VII.

THE ORDER OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

In proceeding now to the consideration of our Communion Service, let me begin by asking of my readers some allowance for the difficulties I feel, in so setting forth my own views in relation to the opinions and arguments of those who differ from me, as to do justice to my own convictions, and at the same time to do no injustice to the views, and no injury to the feelings of those who maintain the Real Objective Presence. If sometimes I shall fail to overcome these difficulties, I trust the failure will not be set down to any desire to offend.

Generals do not concentrate their forces on sandhills, nor build fortifications on mud banks, if there is a strong height within easy reach.

It argues ill for the possession of strong points and great points, when men plant their strength on what is weak and small.

Let it not seem to be said unkindly, when I say, that it cannot but strike one, as arguing forcibly against any real strength in their position, that in dealing with the service for the Holy Communion, the maintainers of the Real

Objective Presence, are found to build their arguments so much upon what may fairly be called small matters, some of them mere minutiæ and grammatical niceties.

When we enter on an examination of this service, surely we are entering on that which should yield us at once, abundantly and unmistakably, the teaching of our Church's doctrines on the subject of the Eucharist.

Surely great truths, truths to be taught and held as *de fide*, should not here be left to be laboriously spun out of thin threads, the spider's webs of minute verbal and grammatical criticisms.

Those, whose views I am here opposing, must allow me to say, not at all, I trust, in anything like a spirit of triumph over what appears to me their weakness, but simply in a desire to bring the true state of the case (as it seems to me) clearly and forcibly before my readers, that such an examination of the service as these criticisms rise out of, seems almost like the microscopical examination of some palimpsest manuscript, in which curious eyes desire to decipher some characters of the older and obliterated writing, discernible yet under the plain and obvious marking of a more recent hand. Or perhaps, in some cases, it may be more like the straining of the eyes to discover whether our Reformers, after ruling their lines straight, have always exactly kept to those lines: whether a very minute and searching investigation may not discover some small strokes, perhaps a little too high, or some turns a little too low, while the broad and clear characters which meet the naked eye, are seen all following their line too plainly, and marking their sense too clearly and distinctly to admit of a question.

To aim at answering all such criticisms as these, appears to me to be giving them an undue importance.

Nevertheless, since it is not pleasant to have shown to us, by an oxy-hydrogen microscope, black monsters in a drop of water, and then to be told that this water is what we are drinking every day, it may be worth while to take one or two examples, by which it may be seen, that as sometimes dark shadows may be cast from some fault in the lens, instead of from some terrible pollution in the liquid, so some of these microscopical revelations of what we should regard as false teaching in our Prayer Book, may be found after all to have in them nothing so very formidable.

(1) One such example, and it appears to be thought to involve a most serious difficulty for us, is found in the first exhortation, where it is said that "God hath given His Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ . . . . to be our spiritual food and sustenance *in that holy Sacrament, which,* being so divine . . . . to them who receive it worthily, and so dangerous to them that presume to receive *it* unworthily, etc." Here a dilemma is before us. The antecedent of "*which,*" must be "holy Sacrament." We are to choose our sense of "holy Sacrament." Does its sense here include the *res Sacramenti?* If we answer "No," then we are told, that our Saviour Jesus Christ, our food and sustenance must be "in the elements." If we answer, "Yes," then we must acknowledge that some presume to receive, and do receive, the "res Sacramenti," *i. e.*, the body and blood of Christ unworthily. Choose which we will, we are to find ourselves brought to the acknowledgment, somehow, of the "Real Objective Presence."

But, is it anything very strange or unnatural to understand "that holy Sacrament" to signify the whole ordinance? And if not, where then is there any shadow of a difficulty remaining?

(2) Another example is set before us as presenting a very serious difficulty indeed.

The difficulty is in the very words of administration. "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life."

It is expressed in the following words taken from "Fragments, by Edward Husband, Priest of the Church of England." (Palmer.) "If then the BREAD is not the BLESSED BODY. . . . . I am guilty of a FALSEHOOD every time I use those words, and knowingly DECEIVE the hearts of the Faithful by declaring It to be what It is not. . . . . But what will you say of us, the Priests of the Most High God, if we at Holy Communion offer you That which we certify by our words, to be 'the body and blood' of the Lord, and all the time ourselves believe It to be nothing more or less than earthly bread and wine, to be received in remembrance of an absent Christ? Why, I think you would say, 'Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?'

"Oh! sooner far than uttering these 'words of administration' without believing in what they say, in our own souls, let us resign our position altogether, and seek some place where we should not SEAR *our conscience*, by UTTERING *with our lips* what we do NOT *believe* in our hearts!" (Pages 11, 12.)

I must profess myself unable to see WHERE in the words alluded to, is to be found that which Mr. Husband considers must be such an insuperable difficulty to us.

But I rather think, wherever the difficulty may be supposed to lie, the argument of Mr. Husband will be sufficiently met by asking ONE *question*. What WOULD Mr. Husband have thought of our bondage, if instead of having on our souls the burden which the Church of England has laid on

us, we had in its place the yoke which would have been imposed by the Westminster Assembly, who in their Directory, appoint the minister to "break the bread and give it to the communicants," saying, "Take ye, eat ye, THIS IS THE BODY OF CHRIST which is broken for you; do this in remembrance of Him."

Apply the same rule to the words of distribution, and if it might make the Church of England seem to be Lutheran, the Puritan divines might be judged to be Papists.

I have spoken of such arguments as microscopical arguments. I trust in speaking thus, and in using such illustrations as I have used, I may not seem to have been treating the matter in a way unseemly or unbecoming. It is with no desire to treat the arguments of the Ritualists contemptuously that I have resorted to them. If any apology is considered due for what I have said, or the way I have said it, I trust such apology will be accepted with an assurance that I am very far from wishing to treat any of these arguments or their maintainers with levity or with any want of due courtesy. I gladly bear testimony to the ability with which those arguments have been supported, and the zeal which has been manifested in their defence. But still the truth is the truth. And some such illustrations appear to me best capable of bringing out clearly into view what I cannot but regard as the truth in this matter. To some extent I shall be obliged myself to use the microscope in this paper. Possibly, to some minds really desirous to look at these things fairly, and to weigh them according to their true weight, some of these matters may seem to be more important than they have appeared to me, and I may be thought to have been making them too small, and treating them too lightly. Possibly I may have erred in that

direction, though I hope I have not desired to do so. But the point I wish to press is this,—that for a true view of the testimony borne by this service to the matter before us, we are called upon primarily to look round on the service "in the length and the breadth of it." It must be allowed by all, I think, that such arguments as these are *comparatively* insignificant.

We have the broad field before us of our Church's "Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper." Surely here we should be as "in a land flowing with milk and honey." And then we are constrained to ask—Are we to be set to look for that which is regarded as the milk and honey hidden sparsely in such recondite recesses as these?

No. But we will stand and look round, and ask our readers to look round with us on the broad surface before us.

Let it not be taken amiss, if I venture to express a conviction that this controversy only needs to be driven out of holes and corners, and brought well out into the open.

Let us cease, then, from analysing phrases and expressions which surely were never meant to be analysed thus. Let us take a comprehensive view of the Service in its grand features and its bold outline. And looking round, let us ask—*Where*, here, are we to find this all-important teaching (in the view of some) of a real presence in the elements and of an oral reception? Where is the teaching of reception by unbelievers? Where is the doctrine of a sacrifice of Christ's present body and blood offered up in the elements, and so pleaded before the Father by the priest? Where is the teaching of a presence to be adored under the forms of bread and wine?

Where are these teachings? these doctrines which we are to hold as *de fide?*

Truly, if they are to be found anywhere, they must be found "under the microscope."

And what then about this absence—this absence of all that should give to our Service the character and impress of the "Real Objective Presence"?

Surely we may do right to enquire about it, and take note of the answer we receive—that this absence came of a CLEARING, and that the *date* of this CLEARING was the *date* of the REFORMATION, and that the *work* of this CLEARING was the *work* of the REFORMERS.

And shall we not do well also to note, what the history of our Church will tell us—that for such-like CLEARING work many perished at the stake, and gave their bodies to be burned, rather than put a hand to build up what thus they had destroyed?

Yes. But we must do more. We must mark well that this CLEARING work of our Reformers was not directed only to the removal of the superstitions which clung to *transubstantiation*. Their axes and saws were not used only on such strong boughs of Popery as this. They were not satisfied with cutting down the topmost branches of the trees. No. That which, in the sight of those who hold the Real Objective Presence, should be as the milk and honey of the goodly land, in the eyes of our Reformers was all as gall and wormwood. And their mattocks and pick-axes were at work *under ground*. They were resolved, if possible, to leave NO ROOT that should bear such gall and wormwood.

And the history of the *clearing* which our Communion Service has seen, is the history of an *uprooting*. It is the

history of a work carried on in the spirit of him whom God appointed as the foreman in the work, and who took up his tools crying to his fellows—"The rest is but branches and leaves, the cutting away whereof is but like topping and lopping of a tree, or cutting down of weeds, leaving the body standing and the roots in the ground; but the very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the REAL PRESENCE of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar (as they call it), and of the SACRIFICE and oblation of Christ *made by the priest*, for the salvation of the quick and the dead. Which roots, if they be suffered to grow in the Lord's vineyard, they will overspread all the ground again with the old errors and superstitions. These injuries to Christ be so intolerable, that no Christian heart can willingly bear them."

It was with such words as these, and in such a spirit as this, that Archbishop Cranmer set to "his hand and his axe with the rest" at the great CLEARING work which was before them.

And the result of such a determination, such a settled purpose to leave *no root* that might spring up and bear the gall and wormwood of a "Real Objective Presence" and its concomitant doctrines, is seen in the matters of difference between the first and second Prayer-books of Edward the Sixth. The first Prayer-book indeed was quite capable of being used without offence. In it all that could be said even to look like transubstantiation has been lopped off, the sacrificial character was maimed, and the adoration was gone, and there was nothing on the surface that must needs have seemed evil, if only it were interpreted according to the sense of the Articles subsequently pub-

lished. But like the phrase in the Notice at the end of the first book of Homilies, there was something in it which might seem at least to have something of a *sound*, or perhaps something of a *flavour* of a "Real Presence" in a Lutheran sense. There were ROOTS. And before the spirit which animated Cranmer and his associates, the roots must be rooted up. They could not rest satisfied till they had applied axe and hand to a more thorough CLEARING. These causes of offence must be removed. In that new CLEARING there must be a more thorough *uprooting*. And axes and hands went to work again, not indeed, with intemperate precipitancy, not with fanatical disregard of ancient landmarks, not without the wisdom and prudence and caution of well-learned and able Divines:—not at all in the spirit of those, who, for no sufficient cause, would prefer that which comes new from their own pen to those sacred and time honoured heritages of the Christian Church, which having been received from the times of purer faith, might well be cleansed from the superstitions and corruptions with which after ages had encrusted them; but still, not the less, yea rather all the more, and all the more notably, with stedfast and deliberate resolution, they went to work; with earnest and settled purpose to clear away whatever remained in our Communion Service, that might give reasonable cause for offence, or occasion for the planting and growing and spreading of superstitious practices or dangerous doctrines. And as the result we have now an order for the administration of the Lord's Supper, in which it requires a microscope to discover the root of a weed left behind.

No doubt it may be alleged (and few I imagine will dispute it) that in Cranmer's mild and gentle disposition there was that, the tendency of which was sometimes to make

his policy seem feeble rather than firm, hesitating rather than decided, slow and cautious rather than vigorous.

No doubt it may be urged that there were those at the time (and there have been some such ever since), who were dissatisfied with the result, and regarded Cranmer and his associates as being even weak and half-hearted in their work of Reformation. But was Cranmer ever accused by such, of leaving in our Liturgy any roots of the doctrine of the Real Corporal Presence? If not; does not the very slowness and caution and moderation of the Reformers of our Liturgy make all the more evident and conspicuous the purpose and resolution which, in this matter at least, made their action to be vigorous, and their work to be thorough? In this particular, certainly, Cranmer's convictions were strong, and his hand was not feeble, and his purpose was stedfast, and his spirit was resolute, and his mind knew no indecision.

Cranmer and his associates may have been slow in casting off the faith of a Corporal Presence. But, having after much consideration, deliberately repudiated it at last, they were thoroughly and heartily in earnest in the work of uprooting it.

Cranmer was not always irresolute. And of the doctrine of the Eucharist, it may be said—Here his strength lay. In this matter, when (after the most careful investigation) his long cherished views of the Presence had quite given way; when he had made up his mind, and put on his armour; then he came forth as a champion, with an invincible energy and power and determination, such as could not but win the admiration, even of some who had been disposed to mistrust him. And then with no hesitating and wavering mind, with no faint and feeble purpose

(we may be sure) he took his place—the foremost place—among those, who, with minds not less earnest in the work than his own, sat down to revise and make perfect the Communion Service of the Church of England.

If, in arranging the Liturgy of the English Church, our Reformers had acted as men having received as their orders "Cut away everything; spare nothing," then would the clearing process have afforded no special historical argument as to the repudiation of any particular doctrine.

But, if, on the other hand, our Reformers have acted rather, as in obedience to such a command as this—"Spare where you may; reject nothing rashly; don't cut away without cause;" then the marked and consistent rejection of passages or expressions seeming to favour a particular doctrine, must be allowed to afford a historical argument of our Church's repudiation of that particular doctrine.

Again, if our present Liturgy had been the result of a single review of ancient offices, then we should not have had anything like so forcible an argument as we now have against the Real Corporal Presence; for it might have been said that all the changes resulted from a strong repugnance to the Romish doctrine of *transubstantiation only*. As it is, we know that whatever sounded of distinctively Romish doctrine had been eliminated from Edward's first Book. It will hardly be maintained that there were any roots of transubstantiation left. But the changes in the second manifest a purpose too plain to be disputed, of expunging passages which might seem to give shelter—not for transubstantiation—but for the doctrine of the Real Corporal Presence.

Acting on principles which were conservative of what

might be preserved, the highest and strongest principles of our Reformers were destructive of *this*. Sparing what might be spared, they knew nothing of listening to a voice which would bid them spare *this*.

Let those who question that the CLEARING process of the Reformation aimed at such an UPROOTING of the doctrine of the Real or Corporal Presence institute a comparison between the Prayer Book of 1549 and the Prayer Book of 1552, and herein let them mark especially *three* things:—

1st. The Rejection of all forms of expression such as might seem to teach the communicants to seek for the Presence of Christ in the Consecrated Elements.

2nd. The entire removal of the Sacrificial Character from the Service.

3rdly. The important significance of the Change in the Prayer of consecration.

I. As to the first of these three things;—Four examples may be given. (1.) In the Prayer Book of 1549 we have the words, "And to the end that we should alway remember the exceeding love of our Master and only Saviour Jesus Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by His precious blood-shedding He hath obtained to us, He hath left in those holy mysteries, as a pledge of His love, and a continual remembrance of the same, His own blessed Body and precious Blood, for us to feed upon spiritually, to our endless comfort and consolation."

In 1552, this is changed. There is now no word of the body and blood of Christ being *left* to us "in those holy mysteries." But instead we are told "He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of His love and continual remembrance of His death, to our great and

endless comfort." The change was not necessary, but it was clearly significant.

(2.) Again. In a Prayer which in 1549 followed immediately on the Prayer of Consecration were the words "And here we offer and present unto Thee (O Lord) ourself, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee; humbly beseeching that whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction."

These words might indeed seem to imply such a Presence in the Elements that in receiving them, those who were partakers of this Holy Communion might *unworthily* receive Christ's body and blood. But in 1552 this ROOT, out of which evil might grow, was removed, and instead the words were inserted, "Beseeching Thee, that all we who are partakers of this Holy Communion, may be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction."

(3.) Again the Prayer near the end of the Service commencing "Almighty and everliving God" is carried on in the Book of 1549 in these words, "we most heartily thank Thee, for that thou hast vouchsafed to feed us *in these holy mysteries*, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, and hast assured us (duly receiving the same) of Thy favour and goodness towards us." The words might have been soundly interpreted. But very indicative of the *clearing axe*, and the stedfast purpose of the Reformers is the change in 1552 which gives us these words, "We most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, which have *duly received these holy mysteries*, with the spiritual food of

the most precious body and blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ."

(4.) Again in 1549, a Rubric at the end of the Service declares, "Men must not think less to be received in part, than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

In 1552 this rubric, which, unexplained, looked too much like a Corporal Presence in the Elements was uprooted and swept quite away.

These changes may, not one of them, perhaps, be regarded as highly important, viewed singly and separately. But their true significance is to be estimated by a view of them in conjunction, not only with one another, but with the other and far more important changes, which are yet to be noticed.

II. The second point to be observed is the Removal of the Sacrificial character from the Service. I mean of course the word "sacrificial" here to point to the meaning of "*sacrifice*" maintained by our opponents, as something entirely different from mere commemorative sacrifice, and the offering of ourselves, our souls and bodies, and the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

With reference to this point, it is to be observed that there was a very significant change in the very title of the service. In 1549 the title was "The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass." Here indeed is an indication of a desire not to appropriate a name which in the ears of men in those days *sounded* of sacrifice. But in the Second Book the word is cleared away altogether, and the title stands, "The order for the administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion."

So also the word "Altar" which was retained in 1549 is

entirely removed from the Book of 1552. And on the significance of this change the following words may be taken as a comment:—

"When the same thing is signified, it may not be of much importance by what name it is called; but the distinction between an Altar and a Communion Table is in itself essential and deeply founded in the most important difference in matters of faith between Protestants and Romanists; namely, in the different notions of the nature of the Lord's Supper which prevailed in the Roman Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation, and those which were introduced by the Reformers. By the former it was considered as a sacrifice of the body and blood of the Saviour. The Altar was the place on which the sacrifice was to be made; the elements were to be consecrated, and being so consecrated were treated as the actual body and blood of the victim. The Reformers, on the other hand, considered the Holy Communion not as a sacrifice but as a feast, to be celebrated at the Lord's Table." (Final Judgment in the case of "Liddell v. Weston," quoted in Principles at Stake, p. 164.)

But as to this removal of the sacrificial character from the Book of 1552, let me quote the words of another.

"Mr. Stuart says: 'The Eucharistic sacrifice, then, consists in offering before God, as well as man, that memorial of the death of Christ which our Lord himself ordained.' He then refers to a passage in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.: 'We Thy humble servants do celebrate, and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make.' He then adds: 'This is, simply, that chief and central act of Christian worship, which in the Church of England we

commonly call the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and which is still called amongst Roman Catholics, as it used to be called among ourselves, the Mass.' On this passage I desire to make a few remarks. In order to obtain even the semblance of evidence in favour of his view, he has to refer to the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. Mr. Stuart knows perfectly well, that we are no more bound by that passage than we are by the Roman Catholic Missal. The very fact that it was expunged when the Prayer Book was revised (in 1552), proves that the Reformers felt that its retention would at least seem to sanction a doctrine which involves blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits. I am astonished that Mr. Stuart should refer the passage. The late Archdeacon Wilberforce, in his book on the Eucharist, distinctly acknowledges that the removal of this passage stripped our Communion Service of its sacrificial character. I need scarcely say he advocated the views held by Mr. Stuart and the advanced Ritualists. His words, which deserve special attention, are these: 'The Service was divested of its sacrificial character, and no longer bore witness, as in early times, to the great event which is transacted at the altar. This was done, both by mutilating the Prayer of Oblation, which had been retained in the Book of 1548, and by placing it after, instead of before, the Communion.' Here, then, is enough to damp the ardour, one would think, of the warmest advocate of the Mass,—to be bound to use a Service for the offering of the Holy Sacrifice, which is divested of its sacrificial character, and which no longer bears witness to the great event transacted at the altar. But here, again, the editor of the *Directorium Anglicanum* suggests a way of getting over what to ordinary minds would appear an insuperable difficulty; viz., by offering up a silent prayer

after the words of consecration, during which the priest is to repeat secretly the prayer of the Roman Catholic Missal, offering up the body and blood of the Saviour as a sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead."*

Let me conclude this portion of the subject by quoting very weighty words of Archbishop Longley, written shortly before his death:—

"Seeing, then, the complexion which the Reformers, with all these expressions of respect for the ancient doctors of the Church, have given to our Communion Service, it seems impossible to doubt that they had weighed well those passages of the Fathers which are generally adduced in favour of the sacrificial view, and had judged that the corrections and explanations to which I have alluded were the true key to their real opinions. Wherefore they treated the Holy Office throughout as merely the commemoration of the great Sacrifice, or if it is to be treated as a sacrifice in itself only as a spiritual sacrifice or act of worship, without any reference to the offering of the elements, either before or after consecration."

III. The third point to be marked is the important significance of the change in the Prayer of Consecration.

In 1549, we have the words—"Hear us (O merciful Father) we beseech Thee; and with Thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ," etc.

But in the Consecration Prayer as altered in 1552, there

* The Rev. J. Bardsley, in "Truths for the Times" (Hunt) pp. 92—94.

is no asking at all for anything that might seem like a change in the elements, no asking that they may even BE anything TO US — though such an expression might have been *explained* in a very *sound sense*. No. The uprooting process must do a clearing work even here. And in the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI., the Consecration Prayer only asks that "we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesu Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood."

Of this prayer as thus altered it may be truly said, that when it asks that in receiving the elements we *may be* partakers of the "*res sacramenti*," it asks that which *does* indeed imply that the consecrated bread and wine may be received where the "res sacramenti" is not received; and therefore that there cannot be any such a Real Objective Presence of the body and blood of Christ under the forms of the bread and wine, as our opponents maintain.

Let us hear what is said by Dr. Brett, the non-juror, of this new Consecration Prayer:—

"I was and am very desirous to believe that the Church of England holds the doctrine so plainly taught by our Saviour. But I know not how to reconcile the Consecration Prayer in the present established Liturgy to this doctrine; for that makes a plain distinction betwixt the bread and wine and our Saviour's body and blood; when, as Mr. Spinckes shows, and the words will bear no other construction than that, it was the bread which Christ said was His body; whereas the Consecration Prayer evidently supposes them to be two distinct things. 'Grant that we, receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, may be partakers of

Christ's body and blood.' Which manifestly implies the bread and wine to be distinct or different things from the body and blood. For if the bread be Christ's body, as Mr. Spinckes proves the words of institution teach, then he that receives or partakes of the bread must be a partaker of the body. And except they are supposed to be two things, then the prayer is that we, receiving or partaking of the body and blood of Christ, may be partakers of His body and blood."

"Such," says Dean Goode, "is the statement of a learned Divine, holding the doctrine, not of the presence of the natural body and blood of Christ, but of their life-giving virtue, in the consecrated bread and wine, so as to constitute a virtual presence of that body and blood in them, and desirous of finding that the Church of England, in her Communion Service, sanctioned this modified view of the doctrine of a Real Presence. He declares it utterly impossible to reconcile this passage with that view."

How much more, it may be asked, is this prayer (on the face of it) repugnant to the doctrine (as now taught) of the Real Objective Presence?

Before passing on, the reader must be asked to observe that, in the case of all these changes which we have been marking as intimating the uprooting principle which guided our Reformers in rejecting what might look like a "Real Objective Presence," THESE CHANGES ABIDE; and abide in spite of endeavours made to remove them. Slight alterations have since been made. The Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. has not been left untouched.

Nay: let me not desire to convey any false impression. Let me not seek to present to the reader one side only of

the truth. Let it, in all fairness, be confessed, and confessed without grudging, that our Communion Service has not been left altogether untouched by the influence of what may be called, perhaps a reactionary movement—reactionary, at least, in so far as some may think, or may have thought that in the reign of King Edward the axes of our Reformers struck too deep, and while rooting up the tares, disturbed sometimes the roots of good wheat. Such reactionary influence, indeed, so far as it has affected our Prayer Book, I cannot but think, has sometimes been much over-estimated.

But, be this as it may, the point which I desire to insist upon is this, that the broad view and the main features are unchanged. And I think it most important for us in this matter to take as far as possible, a broad view, and rise above mere details. In the main, we may surely say, the substance of our Communion Book is unaltered.

Still we look in vain for the restoration of such expressions as before looked most like a Corporal Presence. Still we look in vain for any Invocation of the Holy Spirit on the Elements. Still we look in vain to find in the Consecration Prayer any asking for any such inherent change in God's creatures as the Objective theory requires. Still we look in vain for any such sacrificial language as the maintainers of that theory desire. Still we look in vain for any such adoration as we are told a "Real Objective Presence" demands.

Those who regard themselves as sacrificing priests ministering at an altar may indeed, using our service, seek to supply its deficiencies by unauthorized postures, and words spoken in secret. But not the less I think, must our maimed service (in their view) by that very maiming bear witness against them, bear witness, I mean, by what is

absent, and absent because removed, that it does not hold, and does not teach, and is determined not to teach what, in their view is the great doctrine of the Eucharist.

After all that has been done in subsequent revisions the great and important changes which indicate the rejection of the Corporal Presence, remain substantially inviolate.

Doubtless, it may be urged, that after all, the evidence produced has failed altogether to prove that our Communion Service contains any DENIAL of the Corporal Presence—that no attempt even has been made to show that in this service our Church has said a plain "No" to that doctrine —that all that has been contended for has been her simply not saying, and refusing to say to it her "Yes."

But let the subject be fairly considered in view of the question "What is it which we ought reasonably to look for in such a service?" Let it be granted—and I trust it *will* be granted as an axiomatic truth—that an office for administration of the Holy Communion ought to contain (1) NO *negations* of doctrine, (2) but the *teaching* TO THE FULL of the positive doctrine of the Eucharist. And then *absence of teaching*, and *silence as to doctrine* in such an office, must be held to be a *significant* absence, and a SPEAKING silence.

Much in the same way as when a witness has every inducement, and every reason for saying "Yes," and we know that (for some cause or other) his lips are sealed against a "No"—if he stands silent—we argue that that silence is denial; so, I think, from this silence in our Prayer Book, where silence *should not be* if our Church desired to say "Yes" to this doctrine, from the absence of this teaching where teaching on this subject should be TO THE FULL; we might fairly argue a strong presumption of our Church's

denial, even if that silence and that absence stood altogether unaccounted for and otherwise unexplained.

How much more when we cannot but know that that silence is silence constrained, and that absence comes only of careful elimination, forcible expulsion, and deliberate rejection! Surely we are not to forbid history to throw any light whatever on the interpretation of this silence.

Neither may we refuse to receive the light which is thrown upon it from the corresponding expurgation of our Ordinal. And certainly we are not to reject the light thrown upon it from other utterances of our Church, which in suitable places speak her "No" in language which ought to be plain.

At any rate our Mother Church may truly and justly ask of us her sons and daughters such a question as this —"What could I have done more, in such an office as this, to warn you against a doctrine which I trust all of you will renounce?" And if it be said in answer—"Make a new Directory of your own, on another model altogether"—then would there not be some just ground for complaint, that her children should refuse to believe what she would teach, and understand what she would say, until she had quite taken from them an heir-loom, which in wisdom and love she had sought to preserve, that it might be accounted by them a privilege and a blessing?

But we may go further and say, that our Church *has* done more. For though our Communion Service does not, as it should not, deal in negations; yet we have as an appendage of the office a remarkable statement, which can scarcely be regarded as anything less than a very clear and positive denial of the doctrine in question. This statement is what has commonly been called the Black Rubric. And a brief notice of it must conclude this paper.

By the "Black Rubric" we mean the declaration which stands at the end of our Communion Service. It is as follows:—

"Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgement of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy Receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue;) yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved; It is hereby declared, That thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received or unto any Corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one."

This declaration was first inserted in the Second Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth, and there bore its witness to a steadfast and determined purpose to set to the axe to the root of superstition.

It bore its strong and decided testimony against any Real and Essential Presence of Christ's body and blood in the Elements. In the Prayer Book of Elizabeth this was altogether omitted. And it may be that it was prudentially and wisely omitted, because in the circumstances of the

time, while the teaching of the Church of England was to be teaching with a clear voice, yet it may have been not desirable (with many of the people still under the influence of former teachings, who were to be conciliated rather than repelled) to make the Communion Book needlessly offensive. Its restoration however was desired at the Savoy Conference in 1662, by the Puritan ministers. And though thought unnecessary by the Bishops, IT WAS RESTORED. We may thank God it stands now at the end of our Communion Service with its emphatic protest against all adoration of the Sacrament, and its distinct declaration against the Corporal Presence.

But the force of this declaration and the strength of its protest are sought to be evaded. Indeed it must be plain that nothing short of evasion can serve the purpose of the "Real Objective Presence." I must very briefly notice three schemes propounded for escaping its condemnation.

1. The first declares it not authoritative because it is neither a rubric nor a prayer.

2. The second alleges that it cannot be against "The Real Presence" now, because as re-inserted the words "Real and Essential Presence" were changed into "Corporal Presence."

3. The third holds "Real and Essential" as equivalent to "Corporal Presence," but maintains that by both is meant only a local, natural, *i.e.* a carnal, physical, organical Presence.

To the first, I cannot think any answer to be necessary.

To the second, I answer, that "Corporal Presence" being in the language of our Reformers and their successors only another name for the phrase "Real and Essential Presence" (in the sense which it bore in the declaration) the

reason for adopting or allowing the change at the last insertion need not be sought further, than in a natural desire not to seem in any wise even verbally to condemn such men as Hooker, Jeremy Taylor and Morton, who (while still utterly repudiating that *doctrine* of a *Real* CORPORAL Presence which our Reformers rejected) had claimed on our behalf, or used in our service, (to convey the truth of our Reformed Doctrine,) that phrase "the Real Presence" which in the earlier history of the Reformation (though always accepted in an *explained* sense) had been perhaps too commonly given over to the opponents, that it might signify the CORPORAL PRESENCE of Romanists and Lutherans.

As commonly used in King Edward's days "Real Presence" meant a doctrine repudiated by our Reformers. As frequently used in days preceding the last review, it meant a doctrine which our Reformers and their successors contended for. Why retain such a phrase in a sentence of authoritative condemnation, when another was at hand, by which, with less ambiguity, might be expressed the doctrine which was to be condemned?

As to the third (and the answer will apply to the second also) without wading into the depths of the controversy, I think it will be enough (for those at least who have followed the course of these papers) to call attention to the whole connected structure of the Rubric.

First, I must ask my readers to observe the reason which is given for kneeling—viz.: (1) to signify humble and grateful acknowledgment of benefits, and (2) to avoid profanation and disorder. Surely these are not the reasons to give if adoration is due to the very Presence of the Son of God there present under the forms of Bread and Wine.

And, *secondly*, I must ask my readers simply to mark the

reasons given for "No adoration." Here is no reason given of CAUTION, lest some might unwarily be led to worship the *Elements,* instead of the BODY present under their forms. No. But One reason given IS that Christ's natural body is *in heaven* and NOT HERE. The question of *adoration* is made here to rest on the question, WHERE IS CHRIST? Where is HIS BODY? This is no question of visible or physical or organical Presence. It is simply the question of the PRESENCE *itself.*

Observe the answer of our Church to the question of the Adoration is "No" because the answer of our Church to the question of Christ's bodily Presence is "In heaven and not here."

With those too who now maintain the Real Objective Presence, the question of *Adoration* is the question of the *Presence.* The answer to the question of adoration depends on the answer to the question, "Where is Christ's body?" And their answer to the question of the adoration is "YES," because their answer to the question "Where?" (of the presence of Christ's body) is "THERE"—*i.e.*, "there" "under the forms of bread and wine."

Hear the words of Dr. Pusey:—"The question. . . .as to the adoration of our Lord present in the Holy Eucharist, should be considered, apart from any notion of seeming unfitness. . . . . The simple question is—'Is our Lord and God present THERE?' If, or rather since, He is present THERE, the outward appearance is no more hindrance to us, than the dress He wore as man. St. Thomas, when he fell down and cried, 'My Lord and my God,' regarded not what raiment his Lord wore after His resurrection."

Can, then, the ADORATION *required* by the Real Objective PRESENCE of Christ's body PRESENT THERE, *under the forms*

of bread and wine, be reconciled with ADORATION *denied*, BECAUSE Christ's natural body is "IN HEAVEN, and NOT HERE;" and BECAUSE it is "*against the* TRUTH of Christ's natural body to be at *one time* in MORE PLACES THAN ONE"?

In conclusion—(let it be said without bitterness, and let it be said without offence)—I believe that the maintainers of the Real Objective Presence (whatever they may think of some isolated parts) must feel and do feel, must acknowledge and will acknowledge, that our Communion Service, as a whole—regarding what is absent as well as what is present—is out of tune with their most cherished views of Eucharistic doctrine.

From the bottom of my heart (God knows) I would there were not this disagreement.

Believing, as I believe, that the service of our Church *is* in tune with the teaching of Scripture and of the Early Church, I cannot but desire with an earnest desire that the views and opinions of all her ministers might be brought into harmony also with our Reformed Liturgy as it is.

What cause for thankfulness indeed there would be, if so it might be!

Some of those who have been drawn towards the Real Objective View may be clinging to it in the persuasion, that every other view would make the Lord's Holy Supper a void and empty thing.

But by the change, they may be sure they would lose nothing of the *reality*, nothing of the blessedness, nothing of the fulness, nothing of the true joy of the Eucharist Feast. Nay, rather, I am persuaded they would be gainers indeed. There would be a reality of Personal Presence, a reality of perfect atonement, a reality of full possession, a reality of personal appropriation, a reality of spiritual receiving, a

reality of the soul's feeding, a reality of the supply for the soul's great hunger, a reality of assurance, a reality of joy and peace in believing—such as the theory of a Corporal Presence in the Elements cannot but tend rather to mar than to give.

May He who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask or think, grant us with one heart and one mouth to glorify Him through Jesus Christ our Lord!

No. VIII.

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

In our review of the teaching of the English Church, we have been ascending step by step from lower to higher ground. And if, in our upward journey, we have caught sounds from our Church's voice which have spoken clearly on the controversy before us; there can be no question that when we come within the range of her thirty-nine articles "agreed upon for avoiding Diversities of Opinions," her voice strikes upon the ear at once not as a trumpet giving an uncertain sound, but with a clearness and distinctness, such as scarcely leaves any room for the supposition that perchance our ears may have deceived us, or we may not really have understood her voice aright.

Here are the two Articles which bear most directly on the subject.

XXVIII. *Of the Lord's Supper.*

"The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with

faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

"Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

"The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

"The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped."

XXIX. *Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper.*

"The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint *Augustine* saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ; but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing."

Now, in viewing these Articles it must be remembered, that it is insisted upon as of the very essence of the "Real Objective" view, that, after consecration, there is, of necessity, under the forms of bread and wine, such a Presence of the real body and blood of Christ, altogether independent of use, independent of participation, as that, in the reception of the Elements, (unless this Presence be withdrawn) there must of necessity be a reception of the body and blood of

Christ, quite independent of worthiness, quite independent of faith. According to this view he who partakes of the sacramental sign, he who takes and eats the consecrated elements must needs partake of the *res sacramenti*, must needs take, and eat, and drink the body and blood of Christ.

Let the reader look at these Articles with a view to enquire whether this teaching is their teaching. There can be no question, I think, that his answer, on the *prima facie* view will be "No." He will naturally ask: If these Articles meant to teach this doctrine, why is it said, that there is a partaking of the *res sacramenti*, to such as "rightly, worthily and *with faith* receive" the sacrament? Why is it said that the body and blood of Christ are "given, taken and eaten only after an heavenly and spiritual manner"? Why is it said that "the mean" whereby they are received "is *faith*"? Above all, why is it expressly declared that those who are void of a lively faith, however they may receive the sacrament, eat not Christ's body in the use of the Lord's Supper, and are *in no wise* partakers of Christ?

It must be, I think, sufficiently obvious, that in these Articles (as understood in their natural sense) the maintainers of the Real Objective Presence can find nothing to support their own views, nothing which they can truly claim as speaking at all in their favour.

The first aspect of this language is too evidently repugnant to their own distinct declarations of what they hold as "*de fide*." The natural and obvious sense which they bear is too distinctly a repudiation of what is as the very essence of their teaching.

Clearly (I think) those who stand—with our Reformers—in a position of strong and decided opposition to the Corporal Presence, have in these Articles a stronghold all their

own. The fortress is entirely in their possession. What they have to do is to defend alone and not to attack. The tactics of their opponents are necessarily confined to attempts to scale or make breaches in the strong wall of exclusion, by endeavouring to show that the Articles cannot mean to say plainly, what they obviously seem to say so very distinctly.

I have in this Paper to fulfil, what I cannot but regard as a sacred duty in the cause of the Truth, which I am persuaded our Reformers have by these Articles delivered and left us to maintain, as Trustees of that, which they counted not their lives dear unto them, that they might bequeath it as a heritage to their children. And, in endeavouring to fulfil this duty, as in God's sight, and in defence of His Truth, it will be only necessary for me to show that these attempts to take away from the distinctness of our Church's utterances in these Articles, are found upon examination, unable to make one fissure in our walls, and must therefore only tend to make our position more strong, and manifest the weakness of our opponents' weapons.

The assaults will be found to be hottest around Article the twenty-ninth. And in repelling them I shall have to meet objections, which may be put in the form of an endeavour to maintain—

I. That however in ordinary language this Article may seem opposed to the Real Objective Presence, yet in correct theological language it may be otherwise.

II. That this exclusion of the natural by the theological sense of the words is supported by the known opinions of

(1) of Archbishop Parker, (2) of Bishops Cheney and Geste and (3) of St. Augustine.

These allegations I will proceed, therefore, to deal with in their order.

But first, it may be well to repel any preconception which may have arisen from the use of the phrase "effectual signs" in a previous article, as if these words carried with them a Real Objective character, which must needs set something like a Romish or Lutheran impress on our Church's teaching concerning the Eucharist.

To remove any such misconception, it will suffice to point to the language of some few of our Reformers, that by their use of the like phrase—along with the rejection of the Lutheran Real Presence—it may be clear that the phrase in our Reformation language bears no such character and can stamp no such impress.

The following quotation from Archbishop Whitgift will be found direct to the purpose. "You know very well that we teach far otherwise, and that it is a certain and true doctrine of all such as profess the gospel, that the outward signs of the sacrament do not contain in them grace, neither yet that the grace of God is of necessity tied unto them, but only that they be seals of God's promises, notes of Christianity, testimonies and EFFECTUAL *signs* of the grace of God, and of our redemption in Christ Jesus, by the which the Spirit of God doth invisibly work in us, not only the increase of faith, but confirmation also." (Works, iii., p. 382.)

And the following from Archbishop Sandys equally so; "A natural body doth not occupy sundry places at once. Here we have a sacrament, a SIGN, a memorial, a commemoration, a representation, a *figure* EFFECTUAL of the body and blood of Christ." (Sermons, p. 88.)

So also again, "As the graces of God purchased for us by Christ are offered unto us by the word, so are they also most lively and *effectually* by the sacraments." (Ibid, p. 302.)

In the use of such language, indeed, our Reformers were but speaking as Bullinger also spoke. See Decades, v. 314, where he is vindicating his doctrine of the sacraments against those who would make him say that they "differ nothing from profane SIGNS." And his words are, "They are EFFECTUAL, and not without force." And again he says (p 321) "Sacraments have a greater and more EFFECTUAL *force* than any sealed charters can have."

Clearly therefore, there is nothing in these words but what properly belonged to the language of those who most emphatically denied the Corporal Presence.

We may, therefore, proceed at once to deal with the first allegation which is brought against our claim to the twenty-ninth Article as altogether our own—

I. That however in ordinary language its declaration may seem opposed to the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, yet in correct theological language it may be quite otherwise.

There are many, I think, who, having been brought under the influence of Modern Teachers, are led to range themselves on the side of the Real Objective Presence, and to do so under the persuasion that they are only defending our Church's true teaching. And if to any one such, I were to point out the force of this Article, and its distinct bearing on the subject, its denial that in the Lord's Supper such as be void of a lively faith are any ways partakers of Christ, and therein its denial of that which is regarded as such a

test of true doctrine by our opponents; then I should expect, that such a one would tell me at once, that I was misapprehending the very point of the Article, that in the theological language in which it is written, the phrase "partakers of Christ" is equivalent to "partakers of the benefits of Christ's Presence and reception in the Sacrament," that in such language there is no denial of the real receiving of Christ's body and blood under the form of bread and wine in the Eucharist, but only a teaching that such reception cannot be beneficial without faith.

And if I should ask such a one for any evidence of the use of such theological language running so counter to what may be called the ordinary and natural use of language in this matter, I should expect him readily to turn to three or four books on his table, and show me one passage after another, taken from his favourite authors in which this sense is *very clearly* marked upon these words *indeed*, being in almost if not quite every case, set down immediately afterwards or included in an explanatory parenthesis. But to all these passages thus set before me I have one great objection to make, that they all come from the writings of those who, to maintain their position, are *bound* to make their language tally with the language of the Article, and that, how little *that* naturally tallies with their own language and their own views, is manifest by these passages being so constantly followed by this explanatory parenthesis. I wish to speak no hard words when I say, that such theological language cannot but fall under the suspicion of being language made on purpose.

I must ask to have examples of this strange use of theological language of a somewhat less recent date. I ask to

SEE ONE EXAMPLE OF ITS USE IN THE WRITINGS OF THE REFORMERS.

I say that if the allegation is to be made good, it can only be made good by evidence brought from examples somewhere near the date of the composition of our Articles. I give the whole period from the commencement of the Reformation to the end of the reign of Elizabeth, and I ask of those who maintain this use of theological language in our Article, to produce within that period SOME ONE EXAMPLE TO ESTABLISH THEIR POSITION.

Till such examples are produced, I am quite sure it must be pronounced nothing more than reasonable, if we decline to take the evidence produced from modern English writers writing in defence of "The Real Objective Presence", and claiming it as the teaching of the English Church. We shall see as we proceed, how utterly this language is unlike the language of the English Reformation.

For, we observe, that though not concerned as Modern Authors are to make their language agree with the teaching of our Article, yet the Romanists at the time of the Reformation were of necessity concerned to make their own language agree with that language of Scripture (and the Fathers,) on which the teaching of our Article rests as on a sure foundation: and hence, when driven by disputation with our Reformers to make their language agree with this language of Scripture and the Fathers, they resorted to exactly the same expedients as those of our Modern Ritualists, *i.e.* they endeavoured to escape from the difficulty of their position as maintaining a doctrine which necessarily involved the reception by the wicked—when pressed with such sayings as teach that they who eat Christ live by Him —they endeavoured, I say, to escape from this difficulty

by maintaining just the distinction which our Modern Teachers maintain, between a *Real* receiving and an *effectual* or *beneficial* receiving. And was the distinction allowed by our Reformers?

Nay. I should not do very wrong if I were to say it was laughed by them to scorn, it was tossed by them to the winds. When Harpsfield thus in conference with Bradford would maintain that the wicked do receive the VERY BODY of Christ, but not the GRACE of His body, Bradford's reply is "No. They receive NOT *the body:* for Christ's body is no dead carcass: he that receiveth it receiveth the Spirit, which is not without grace, I ween." (Sermons, etc., p. 512.)

When Harding thus in controversy with Jewel, makes a real receiving one thing and effectual receiving another, Jewel has no other answer than this, that this is a very *real and effectual* folly.

Again when Campion the Jesuit would make the same distinction, saying "The wicked eat not Christ effectually and worthily, according to invisible grace," thus he is answered by Goade, "You answer not mine argument out of Augustine; and as for your words and distinction, it is too absurd to separate the eating of Christ Himself from effectual or worthy eating, seeing that whosoever eateth Christ the substance of the sacrament doth live for ever, and so consequently must needs eat Him effectually." (See "A true report of the disputation, etc., with Edwd. Campion, 1581." London, 1583. Third day's Conference. Argument 10.)

Thus, Gardiner, pressed by Cranmer with a saying of St. Augustine, seeks to evade its force by saying "that is not *worthily and well* done, may (because the principal intent faileth) be called *not* done," putting this gloss on St. Augus-

tine's words "not because the body of Christ is not received, which by St. Augustine's mind evil men do to their condemnation, but because the effect of life faileth," (in Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 26). But what has Cranmer to reply to this shift?

Truly he has a reply, which shivers not only Gardiner's evasion, but with it all the arguments by which the force of our Article is now sought to be evaded. Cranmer's words in reply are these—"Thus allege I St. Augustine truly, without adding anything of mine own head, or taking anything away. And what sleight I used is easy to judge: for I cite directly the places, that every man may see whether I say true or no. And if it be not true, quarrel not with me, but with St. Augustine, whose words I only rehearse. And that which St. Augustine saith, spake before him St. Cyprian, and Christ Himself also plainly enough; upon whose words I thought I might be as bold to build a true doctrine for the setting forth of God's glory, as you may be to pervert both the words of Cyprian, and of Christ Himself, to stablish a false doctrine to the high dishonour of God, and the corruption of His most true word. *For you add this word* 'worthily,' *whereby you gather such an unworthy meaning* of St. Augustine's words as you list yourself. And the same you do to the very words of Christ Himself, who speaketh *absolutely and plainly, without adding any such word as you put thereto.* What sophistry this is, you know well enough. Now if this be permitted unto you, to add what you list, and to expound how you list, then you may say what you list without controlment of any man, which it seemeth you look for." (On Lord's Supper, pp. 26, 27.)

But most noteworthy are the words of Cranmer, when again Gardiner would escape from the cogency of his argu-

ments by the same sort of evasion. "Whereas," he says, "I have fully proved as well by authority of Scripture as by the testimony of many old writers, that although evil men eat the sacramental bread and drink the wine, which have the names of His flesh and blood, yet they eat not Christ's very flesh nor drink His blood; your short and whole answer is this, that evil men may be said *not to eat* Christ's flesh and drink His blood, because they do it *not fruitfully*, as they ought to do; 'and that *may be called* A NOT EATING, as they may be said not to hear God's word, that hear it not profitably; and a thing not well done, may be in speech called not done, in the respect of the good effect.' I grant such speeches be sometime used, but very rarely; and *when the* VERY TRUTH *cometh in discussion*, then *such* PARADOXES ARE NOT TO BE USED. As if it came in question whether a house be builded, that is not well builded, then the definition of the matter must not be, that it is not builded, although the carpenters and other workmen have failed in their covenant and bargain, and not builded the house in such sort as they ought to have done. So our Saviour Christ teacheth that all heard the word, whether the seed fell in the highway, or upon the stones, or among the thorns, or in the good ground. Wherefore when this matter cometh in discussion among the old writers, whether evil men eat Christ's body or no, if the truth had been that evil men eat it, the old writers would not so precisely have defined the contrary, that they eat not, but would have said, they eat it, but not effectually, not fruitfully, not profitably. But now the authors which I have alleged, define plainly and absolutely, that evil men eat not Christ's body, without any other addition. But after this sort that you do use, it shall be an easy matter for every

man to say what liketh him, and to defend it well enough, if he may add to the Scriptures and doctors' words at his pleasure, and make the sense after his own phantasy. The Scriptures and doctors which I allege do say in plain words, as I do say, that evil men do not eat the body of Christ, nor drink His blood, but only they that have life thereby. Now come you in with your addition and gloss, made of your own head, putting thereto this word 'effectually.' If I should say that Christ was never conceived nor born, could not I avoid all the Scriptures that you can bring to the contrary, by adding this word 'apparently,' and defend my saying stoutly? . . . . And what heresy can be reproved, if the heretics may have that liberty that you do use, to add of their own heads to the words of Scripture? . . . Moreover, the authorities, which I have brought to approve my doctrine, do clearly cast away your addition, adding the cause why evil men cannot eat Christ's flesh nor drink His blood." (Cranmer on Lord's Supper, p. 215.)

Now, let us just look round, at the actual state and position of things—the Reformers well acquainted with just the same distinctions as those of the Ritualists—the Reformers rejecting them utterly, as advanced by Romish antagonists—the Reformers also maintaining as one man the doctrine which is contained in the words of the Article as naturally and obviously understood—the Reformers too quite capable of expressing themselves clearly in this matter, and language being very capable of being made to express the distinction maintained; and let us ask, Is it likely, is it possible, that in framing this Article they have adopted a distinction they repudiated to make way for a doctrine they contended against most earnestly, and have expressed themselves in language most unlikely to convey the meaning they meant,

when words were at hand which might readily have conveyed that meaning unmistakeably?

For what—we may ask, on such an extraordinary hypothesis as that of their wishing to say in this Article what Ritualists wish to make its true meaning—What was there to hinder their speaking out clearly? If they meant the word "partakers" to signify a beneficial or effectual reception, What hindered their inserting the word "*beneficially*" or "*effectually*"? What hindered their framing the remainder of the Article so as to express what they meant clearly, instead of hiding it under words, which could only naturally express what they did *not* mean? What conceivable purpose can they be supposed to have had for running such a risk of letting their true sense suffer shipwreck, when one word so easily might have been taken in to avoid it?

Nay, more. Our Reformers did not only *not* take in such a word, but there is evidence that they really did of set purpose omit such a word, for in the passage alluded to in St. Augustine, there was a word ("spiritually") standing there (probably by interpolation, but *still standing*) and sometimes retained in the writings of Reformers when quoting the same passage. And this word might not only have suggested the insertion of some other such word, but if it had itself been retained it might possibly have helped somewhat to make some room for such an unnatural meaning as it contended for. But what did the compilers of our Articles do? Not only they failed to make any such insertion, but they so paraphrased the earlier words of St. Augustine's sentence as to *exclude* that *very* interpolated *word* which might have seemed to modify his meaning.

Yet further. The Article has not only rejected the word

"*spiritually*," which might possibly have left room for a partaking *some other wise;* but it has adopted the word "*nowise*," which can hardly be anything else than a closing the door (in the case of the faithless) against *oral reception* as well as *spiritual reception*, and a denial of partaking *unfruitful-wise* and *ineffectual-wise* quite as much as of partaking *fruitful-wise* and *effectual-wise*.

But we must add to this, that the subject of this Article was felt very much at the time of the Reformation, as it is felt now, to be a most important part of the controversy, and a test of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence.

The Question, "Do the wicked and faithless receive the body and blood of Christ?" separated Christians so called into two classes. On one side of that Question were Romanists and Lutherans, and they both answered "Yes." On the other side were those named "Reformed," and these answered "No." Archdeacon Denison was not the first to apply this unfailing test. Ask concerning the "Real Presence" and all might in one sense or other accept the term. Ask concerning the manner of the Reception, whether it be a heavenly and spiritual manner apprehended by faith; and the Reformed would very gladly and heartily say "Yes." But (however unnaturally) in some sense, Lutherans would say the same. But ask concerning what unbelievers receive in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and then as now, it was felt that the question was a testing question, which must send you to one side or the other. And here we have an Article which deals with this very testing question. Every one would look to this Article for its "Yes" or its "No" to the question. Strange if its answer in natural language should be "No;" but when looked at through this strange theological language we should find it

turned to "Yes"! Strange indeed, if on such a point theological language should be incapable of speaking expressly its "Yea," except through words which to common ears sound plain "Nay"!

And it may not be argued that the Article did not mean to have anything to do with this testing question, that it meant to leave it quite on one side, to let it rest an open question, not, in fact to say anything to that subject at all. For even if the body of the Article could thus be explained, yet the heading of the Article must be allowed to indicate the subject of the Article, must be conceded to point to that which the Article is intended to speak to. And the heading of the Article sets forth the subject of the Article as this very testing subject. Nay more, much more, it tells not only the question it intends to answer, but it tells us the answer it means to give, for the heading is, "Of the wicked which eat not the body and blood of Christ."

But it will be said, "The heading is no part of the Article, and in subscribing the Articles we are not required to subscribe to the headings. You have therefore no right to take the meaning out of the heading and impart that meaning into the Article."

Perhaps not. But I am sure I *have* a right, in all common sense, and in all common fairness, to use the sense of that heading, expressing as it does the known views of our Reformers on this testing question, declaring as it does the Article's intention, in accordance with the known views of our Reformers,—of repudiating any answer but one to that testing question,—I am sure (I say) I have a right to use the heading of this Article not to add to the Article's meaning, but to protect the only natural meaning of the Article from being taken from it, to make room for another sense, which

if it be allowed to come in, can only come in to crush what our Reformers set there as in a sure place, giving us the keys for its safe custody.

Let me further ask this question—Upon what conceivable hypothesis are we to account for the fact that this Article, having received the assent of Convocation in 1562, was not allowed to appear in the printed copies, if this Article was not understood to speak to this moot question, and to decide against the Corporal Presence? If, in the language of the time, it was naturally understood to deny only fruitful reception, the influence brought to bear against it appears unaccountable. What objection could any one have to accept and subscribe the Article in such a sense? On the other hand, understood in what I must call its natural sense, the omission was in entire accordance with the policy pursued in the earlier years of Elizabeth's reign. It would be offensive to many, and offensive in a particular, in which it was felt to be very inexpedient, at that time, to give needless offence. Its offence consisted in its applying so severe a test of doctrine, a test which was felt to exclude, of necessity, the doctrine of a Corporal Presence in the Elements.

Further yet, I must ask the reader, who desires to consider fairly the claims of the new interpretation of this Article, to view it beside the following extract from "The Apology of the Church of England." "We *affirm*, together with the ancient fathers, that the body of Christ is *not eaten* but of the good and faithful, and of those that are endued with the Spirit of Christ. Their *doctrine* is, that Christ's very body effectually [*re ipsa*—Latin] and, as they speak, *really* and *substantially*, may not only be eaten of the *wicked and unfaithful* men, but also (which is monstrous to be

spoken) of mice and dogs." (P. S. Edit., p. 92.) Now, will any affirm that in this passage the "Apology" does not, on behalf of the Church of England, deny *simply* the reception of the *res sacramenti* by the unfaithful, and speak of the doctrine which affirms such a reception as one, by the Church of England repudiated?

And shall we then maintain that the Church of England uses one sort of theological language in her "Apology," and (at the same date) quite a different theological language in her Articles?

But we must not only do this, we must also make the Church of England teach *one doctrine* in her Apology, and at the same time, the very *opposite doctrine* in her Articles —if we will maintain that the Article before us does not actually deny all real ["re ipsa"] reception of Christ's body by the unfaithful.

If anything needs to be added, let it be added to all this, that at the date of the framing and first subscribing of this Article, there had been not eight years before, one of our English martyrs, and one not the least honoured, who had been condemned to the stake on the very charge of asserting what this Article in its natural and obvious meaning asserts; and that the very words of Bradford as quoted in his sentence of condemnation correspond almost exactly with the words which stand in the title of this Article. The title of our Article is "Of the wicked which eat not the body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper." Bradford's sentence is the sentence of death because—in the words of that sentence—he said "that an evil man doth not receive it [the body of Christ] *in forma panis*." (See Bradford's Works, ii., p. 585.)

And Bradford declares to Pendleton, "Transubstantiation

is the thing whereof I am condemned, and also the denial of wicked men to receive Christ's body." (See Ibid, p. 542.)

And if it be contended that there may be a difference meant between *receiving* Christ's body and *eating* Christ's body or being *partaker* of Christ's body, then let us observe that Bradford again in his farewell to Walden, declares that he is persecuted because, he says, "I cannot, dare not, nor will not confess transubstantiation: and how that wicked men . . . *eating* the sacrament . . . do *eat* Christ's natural and real body." (Ibid, p. 456.)

Is there anything, then it may be asked, lacking to bring out the identity of language?

And shall we suppose that eight years sufficed to make such a wonderful change in the theological language of the time? or shall we think that the history of Bradford had passed all out of mind?

Or shall we think that Bradford's memory abiding, and language remaining unchanged, the framers of our Articles while desiring to express a totally different thing, were unable to find any language to express their meaning, but that which naturally expressed the very thing for which they knew Bradford had been put to death?

Is it conceivable that they chose to use language which naturally understood would place them as on Bradford's side, while, in truth, they were only meaning to express a doctrine which would rather set them on the side of Bradford's condemners?

Yet to estimate the weight of this evidence at anything like its true value, Bradford's case must not be regarded as standing in an isolated position. No. But it must be viewed in connexion with a fact, a fact of which every attentive reader will have found evidence in the second and

third Papers of this series. I mean the fact, that what Bradford denied, and was burnt for denying (the reception of Christ by the wicked), our Reformers were constantly denying, and denying in the same words in which Bradford denied it. Or to say the same thing in other words, our Reformers were continually teaching and asserting just that which, in its natural meaning, the 29th Article teaches and asserts (that the wicked do in no wise receive Christ), and asserting and teaching it in just the same sort of language as that in which our Article asserts it and teaches it still.

And did the Framers of the Article, being our Reformers themselves, aim at teaching something in the Article quite different from that which our Reformers always taught; and did they think to teach that other and quite different, yea rather that *repugnant* doctrine, in language which *out of the Article* our Reformers always used to signify that which they *did* believe and *did* always teach, viz., that (in the natural and obvious meaning of the words) the wicked do not eat the body of Christ?

For one very plain example of the use of such language, and of the sense in which it was used, let the reader refer to Rogers's "Exposition of the Articles" published in 1585. It will be found to give most important evidence on this point. Rogers speaks of the Ubiquitaries, "which think the body of Christ so is present in the Supper, as His said body, with bread and wine, by one and the same mouth, at one and the same time, of all and every communicant is *eaten* corporally and *received* into the belly." (Page 289.) And again he speaks of "the Ubiquitaries, both Lutheran and Popish," as "Adversaries to this doctrine" because of their "saying the very body of Christ, at the Lord's Supper, is eaten as well of the wicked as of the godly; these affirming

that all communicants, bad and good, do eat the very and natural body of Christ Jesus." (Page 293.)

Here is unquestionable evidence given as to the theological language of the time, (1) that the words *eat* and *receive* are used convertibly, (2) that *eat* is not used for profitable eating or receiving, (3) that this Article itself was so understood at this date (fourteen years after its authorization) as that all Ubiquitaries, Lutheran as well as Romanists, were regarded (to use Rogers's own words) as "Adversaries unto this doctrine," *i.e.* to the doctrine declared and stated in this very 29th Article, (4) of the testing character of the question of eating and receiving, as then understood.

It will tend further to illustrate the teaching of our Article from the theological language of the period, to refer briefly to the published account of the Conference with Campion the Jesuit, Sept. 23, 1581. The following is an extract. "*Fulke.* . . . Answer to Saint Augustine, which saith, The wicked eat not the body of Christ in very deed. *Campion.* They eat Christ sacramentally. *Fulke.* Yea, but not in deed, as Saint Augustine saith. *Campion.* They receive the same Christ, but not to the same comfort that the godly do. *Fulke.* They do not receive Christ, saith Saint Augustine: because they are not to be accounted in the members of Christ. *Campion.* And I say the same. *Fulke.* HE SAITH, THEY EAT NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST IN DEED: YOU AFFIRM THAT THEY EAT THE BODY OF CHRIST IN DEED. . . . . *Goade.* I will follow the confutation of that absurd assertion, that the wicked eat the body of Christ, which is easy to be improved many ways, I will frame mine argument thus, Whosoever eateth the body of Christ, doth eat *Rem Sacramenti*, the thing or substance of the Sacrament. But no wicked person can eat *Rem Sacramenti*. *Ergo*, No

wicked person can eat the body of Christ. . . . *Goade.* It is manifest, that Saint Augustine doth make but two parts of the Sacrament, which he doth distinguish, viz., the outward sign which he calleth the Sacrament, and the inward thing or substance of the Sacrament, which is Christ Himself. And out of the same words of Augustine, I follow mine argument thus against your absurd distinction. Whosoever eateth Christ, the thing or substance of the Sacrament, shall live for ever. But none of the wicked or unfaithful shall live for ever. *Ergo,* None of the wicked can eat Christ, being the substance of the Sacrament. . . . *Goade.* . . . Consider the words of Augustine, he affirmeth the Sacrament to consist of two things, the visible *sign,* which he calleth *Hujus rei Sacramentum,* and the invisible grace, or Christ Himself, which he calleth *Rem Sacramenti.*" (Third Day's Conference, Arg. 9 and 10.)

Now let the reader be asked to mark here (1) the use of language corresponding to that of our Article (*eating and receiving* being used indiscriminately) to teach a doctrine diametrically opposed to that of the Ritualists, but just that which agrees with the natural and obvious interpretation of the Article, (2) the appeal—after the manner of the Article—to the teaching of Augustine as clearly supporting this natural sense, (3) the sense attached to "*sign* or *sacrament,*" and regarded as the sense of St. Augustine, which is clearly the sense required for the obvious and natural interpretation of the Article, but which will not agree at all with the sense of the Ritualists. Let the reader also observe that the publication from which this extract is made has the authority of Dean Nowell, the author, probably, of our Church Catechism, and certainly of that larger Catechism, which has received the sanction, if not in full of the Convocation of

1562, yet certainly of the Convocation of 1603 in the 79th Canon.

I trust the reader will not think me wearisome, if I adduce yet another example, giving evidence, both as to the theological language of the period, and also as to the fact of our Article dealing with one of the chief moot-questions of the Reformation.

I refer to the dying testimony of Dr. Redmayne, a man whom Strype speaks of as "a Papist," and "one of the learnedest men of his time," "a Person of extraordinary reputation among all for his great Learning and Reading, and profound knowledge of Divinity, so that the greatest Divines gave a mighty deference to his judgment." Mr. Soames says that "Dr. Redmayne had been engaged during more than twenty years in theological research. His original object in undertaking these laborious enquiries was to confirm himself and others in the religious principles long implicitly admitted by European scholars." But "the result was that he found himself obliged to admit the truth of nearly all the principles which he had reckoned on proving false." He was overtaken by mortal illness in 1551. "While lingering at ease in mind, and unclouded in apprehension, Bishop Ridley and others who knew his worth, resorted to the dying scholar's couch." Strype says, "Many learned men resorted to him, desiring to know his last judgment on several *points*, then so *much controverted*." To Dr. Alexander Nowell, then master of Westminster school, the dying man gave a somewhat detailed account of the theological opinions, to which his long and learned investigations had led him. We must not enter into these except so far as his words bear upon the question before us. But very important is the following declaration made by this

dying man, "Item, That the wicked are *not partakers* of the body of Christ, but receive the *outward sacrament only.*"

Can any one read this and doubt what here is meant by the word "partakers"? Can any one doubt what Dr. Redmayne meant by *the outward sacrament only* received by the wicked?

And shall we think that our Article is using language in quite a different sense, and meaning to affirm quite a different thing, when it asserts that the wicked "in no wise are partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing"?

Yet, just once more, let it be added that in King Edward's reign, Peter Martyr had publicly taught at Oxford (where his lectures as Regius Professor had been so highly valued by many of our Reformers), and that with special reference to the Lutheran doctrine—"Quicquid impii ibi comedant corporaliter, non debent dici comedere Corpus Christi, nisi signo aut symbolo velis tribuere nomen rei."

Will any one maintain that Peter Martyr was not in these words denying all real reception by the wicked? Will any one look at our Article as set beside the words of Peter Martyr, and maintain that it is dealing with an altogether different question, and teaching an altogether different doctrine?

But enough of this, I proceed to reply to—

II. The second allegation, viz., that this non-natural sense of the Article is supported by the known opinions (1) of Archbishop Parker, (2) of Bishops Cheney and Geste, and (3) of St. Augustine.

(1) Archbishop Parker is rightly claimed as the writer of this Article. And though the true meaning of the Arti-

cle is the sense in which it was authorized, which might possibly not be the meaning of the framer; yet let it freely be granted, that the force of our arguments in favour of the natural and obvious meaning of the Article, will be broken up, if it can be shewn that Parker's opinions were certainly or even probably the opinions on this subject of those who hold the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence.

Certainly, till this is shewn, what has been stated presents a most weighty presumption against Parker's holding such views. But if it can be shown indeed, that, in spite of all the presumption against it, Parker *did* hold them, then it must be confessed our arguments will be pretty much brought to nought.

But did Parker hold these views? Trace this opinion concerning Parker to its source, and it will be found—that like many a large river rising from a small fountain—it has its original (I think) in nothing more than the ill-name of "a great Papist" which some Puritan zealots desired to fasten upon him. But then Whitgift too was called by harder names still, and Whitgift as we have seen, in terms renounced "the Real Presence." Nay more; we have seen that Parker too by his approval of Whitgift's book and his own declaration of the oneness of our Church's doctrine stands committed also to a denial of "the Real Presence" on behalf of the English Church.

And it is not difficult to account for Parker's being called a great Papist without his being a Lutheran. Nay: a strong argument might be built on this name against it. For he was called so, because, in his zeal for conformity, he was strong in insisting on the vestments (*i.e.* the surplice, tippet, etc.,) and the vestments by the Puritans were counted "Papistical." And it shows how ready the Puritans were

to find matter for strong language, and to bring accusations for trifles. Should we not then certainly have heard of it, if they could have laid to Parker's charge any such false doctrine? Yet what Puritan ever charged him with teaching the Corporal Presence?

It might be curious to trace the steps by which this doctrine has been brought and laid at Parker's door. The "*Papistical*" name seems to have suggested an identification with those included in the phrase "Lutherano Papistical Ministry" used by Grindal and Horn in writing to Bullinger. And this perhaps may have led to his being classed together with Cheney and Geste; and this again possibly to his being set down as one known to incline to the Lutherans. Now all this building—built (as it would seem) upon one hard name—we must even pull down and lay low: and acknowledging indeed, what some contend for, that the tendency of Parker's mind and principles was to be conservative, we must contend that it was conservative above all of the great principles of the Reformation, conservative, therefore, of the truth that the wicked eat not the body of Christ, and therefore, with all its conservancy, destructive—utterly destructive—of the Real Objective Presence.

In support of this position we call back to witness (1) the *heading* of this Article (leaving the Article out of the question): for, whatever may be said of its relation to the Article, there can be nothing alleged against its evidence of Parker's own views. And if Parker had left us a treatise on this subject, and these words of his had come in the treatise, who would have hesitated to pronounce them decisive? Not, I feel sure, anyone acquainted with the language of our Reformers. Why should they be less

decisive now that they stand as a title to an Article of Religion? (2) We call back to witness Parker's sanction of Whitgift's assertion—of a piece with the teaching of his Book—that this Church hath rejected "the Real Presence." (3) We call back to witness the fact of Parker's careful review and sanction of the "Reformatio Legum" with all its very exceedingly distinct and unequivocal utterances on this subject. (4) We call back to witness the fact of Parker's approval, and more than approval, of Jewel's Apology, with all its emphatic opposition to the doctrine before us. (5) We call for witness the high value and esteem which Parker had for Bullinger, whose very name was bound up with the doctrines of the Reformed. (6) We call for witness Parker's high value of Archbishop Cranmer, whom some now regard as a Zuinglian heretic, but of whose MSS. Parker spoke as "the great notable written books of my predecessor Dr. Cranmer," adding "I would as much rejoice while I am in the country to win them, as I would to restore an old chancel to reparation." (Correspondence, p. 186.)

And let it be remembered that among the treasured writings of Cranmer (and we know that he valued especially Cranmer's writings on the Eucharist) Parker would find the repudiation *passim* of the doctrine which the Ritualists would put in the Article, and not only so, but the indignant repudiation also of the very distinction by which they desire to effect this.

(7) We call for witness his dealing with Geste and Cheney, of whom we shall have more to say presently. Here it must suffice to state, that instead of its being true that Parker was sailing in the same boat with them, Geste evidently felt sorely the weight of Parker's opposition. And

Cheney was once deprived by Parker of the exercise of Episcopal jurisdiction which he had received by commission for Bristol, and once by Parker he was excommunicated. And both the withdrawal of the commission and the excommunication are supposed by Strype, and the excommunication is plainly understood by Geste, to be intimately connected with Cheney's Lutheran tendencies.

(8) We call to witness the character given of him by Puritans who disliking his ritual strictness charged him with no doctrinal error.

(9) We call to bear witness also (and the witness is most important) that *consensus* as to doctrine generally, and the doctrine of the Eucharist in particular, a *consensus* of Churchmen and Puritans, which we know to have prevailed in Parker's days, a *consensus*, of the truth of which we have assurance, not from others only, but from Parker himself, and which others have attributed very much to Parker's own influence.

(10) We call to bear witness Parker's declared estimation of Peter Martyr and Calvin, and that especially in regard of the controversy with Rome.

(11) We call for witness Nowell's express and emphatic denial of the charge when made by a Romanist in the lifetime of Parker himself.

(12) We call for witness his urging (in conjunction with Grindal) the publication of Nowell's Catechism, whose language on the subject is much too plain and emphatic to be approved by those who hold the Corporal Presence.

(13) We appeal also to Parker's identifying himself with the movement which waged war against *altars*, and would have the Lord's Supper administered at a moveable table of wood.

To all this mass of evidence might be added many lesser matters not without their weight; such as Ridley's confidence in him, and Jewel's; his friendship with Becon; his value for Whitgift; his very tender affection for Jewel; his pleading (with other bishops) against images; his desire for the removal of lights and crucifix from the Queen's closet; his care to have Foxe's "Acts and Monuments" set up in all cathedral churches; his editing the Saxon Homily of Ælfric; his high esteem among those who were far from esteeming highly men of Lutheran views; his care to have "The Defence of the Apology" placed in Parish Churches; his glorying in having been consecrated without "Aaronical garments" "according to the purity of the Gospel."

Let this evidence be weighed in the balances of unprejudiced justice, and, I think, judgment will be given to the effect, that instead of the known opinions of Parker having to be set against the arguments for the natural meaning of our Article—what we can gather of his opinions will rather tend to strengthen (if it needed strengthening) our position—and lead us to see here a true disciple of Cranmer, exercising a wise vigilance, after the example of his master, lest the Roots of Evil in the doctrine of the Real Presence should be suffered to grow again in the Lord's vineyard, and overspread all the ground afresh with the old errors and superstitions.

But we have not yet quite done with Parker. Or rather our opponents have something further to allege concerning his part in this article. We have a letter from Parker to Lord Burleigh about it. Some one had evidently suggested to Burleigh's mind a doubt as to whether the citation in this Article from St. Augustine would be found to

establish the teaching of the Article. Burleigh leaves the question to be resolved by Parker, and Parker's letter declares, that having reconsidered the matter, he is of opinion the citation will hold good for so much as it is quoted for. But the whole letter shall be given here.

Archbishop Parker to Lord Burghley, 4th June, 1571:—"Sir, I have considered what your honour said to me this day, concerning St. Augustine's authority in the Article in the first original agreed upon; and I am advisedly still in mine opinion concerning so much wherefore they be alleged in the Article; and for further truth of the words, besides St. Austen, both he in other places, and Prosper, in his 'Sentences wrote of Austen' (Senten. 338 and 339), doth plainly affirm our opinion in the Article to be most true, howsoever some men vary from it." (Parker's Correspondence, p. 381.)

Now the argument of our opponents from this letter stands thus:—the words, "for so much" clearly imply a limitation. They imply that Augustine's words might in error have been cited for more, but that the Article only means to cite them with a limited application, and that for that limited application they hold good. But in the natural sense of the article they do not seem to be limited at all.

The answer to this is very simple. Augustine, while asserting that the wicked do not eat Christ's body —asserted also that, *in a certain* SENSE (or in a CERTAIN WAY) they *did* receive Christ's body, because they received the sacrament of His body, and the sacrament bears the name of the thing signified by it. Now the doubt that would naturally arise was this:—Could the Article which asserts that the wicked are *nowise* partakers of Christ claim support from Augustine's words, when he said also that in *some* sense they do receive his body and blood?

And Parker's reply is worthy of a disciple of Cranmer—that the citation is good for so much as the Article says; for the Article is speaking of things REALLY, of a REAL *reception;* and does not go beyond that to deny what may be said to be done or received sacramentally, *i. e.*, NOT REALLY. On this understanding everything in Parker's letter is intelligible, and free (I believe) from all difficulties. But how great a difficulty would be found in it if we were to read it on the other hypothesis!

Here we have Parker clearly declaring that *some* men vary from "our opinion in the Article." Now we know very well there were *some* (Cheney and Geste to wit) who *did* think otherwise than the natural sense of the Article we are contending for. But will any one maintain that *some* were thinking otherwise than *that sense* of the Article which alone the Ritualists would leave in it? Were there any then—any Divines—any English Theologians—any Bishops or Clergy—who were really of opinion that the wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith—do, in receiving the Lord's Supper, receive Christ effectually and savingly to their soul's health?

If not, then it is perfectly evident that this non-natural sense could not be the sense which Parker attached to the Article, because there *were some* who were opposed to THAT SENSE.

It will probably be felt that sufficient evidence has been here adduced to defend the natural sense of the Article from the force of any arguments arising from the views and writings of Archbishop Parker.

But there remains something yet very material to be added.

Add to all this the extreme improbability (should we not

rather say the utter impossibility?) of an admirer of Cranmer, using language in framing both the title and the substance of an Article—language in accordance with the heading and the substance of an important section of Cranmer's most important work—and supporting that language, as Cranmer there supports it, by appeal to S. Augustin—and yet withal meaning by this language and this appeal, to teach a doctrine utterly discordant from, and in direct opposition to, that which in the treatise of Cranmer stands out with the more unmistakeable clearness, because there it is seen as set in battle array against the very opinions and arguments now aimed against it by the Ritualists, and then by the Papist Gardiner.

Shall we think that Parker put into an Article of Religion expressions such as Cranmer distinctly stigmatizes as "PARADOXES," and of which he declares that however they may sometimes (though rarely) be used, yet when the VERY TRUTH comes in discussion, then they are "NOT TO BE USED"? (Page 215.)

(2) We have next to deal with the case of Cheney and Geste.

Cheney appears to have been a decided Lutheran, and Geste seems to have partly agreed with him (or, at any rate, to have stood with him) on the doctrine of "the Presence." It is clear that he had some leaning either to Lutheran views, or to the use of Lutheran language.

Two letters have been discovered in the State Paper Office written by Geste to Cecil, both relating to the Articles, and both making mention of Cheney's difficulties. The letters may be seen at length in Mr. Perry's "Declaration on Kneeling," (pp. 192—204.) I give the two following extracts. The first is from a letter bearing date December

22, 1566, and is as follows—"I suppose you have heard how the Bishop of Gloucester [Cheney] found himself grieved with the placing of this adverb *onely* in this Article, 'The body of CHRIST is given taken and eaten in the supper after an heavenly and spiritual manner onely' because it did take away the presence of CHRIST's body in the Sacrament, and privily noted me to take his part therein, and yesterday in mine absence more plainly vouched me for the same. Whereas, between him and me, I told him plainly that this word *onely* in the foresaid Article did not exclude the presence of CHRIST's body from the Sacrament, but onely the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof: For I said unto him, *though he took Christ's body in his hand, received it with his mouth, and that corporally, naturally, really, substantially and carnally* as the Doctors do write, *yet did he not for all that see it, feel it, smell it, nor taste it.* And therefore I told him, I should speak against him herein, and the rather because the Article was of mine own penning. And yet I would not for all that deny thereby anything that I had spoken of the presence." (Quoted from Goode on Eucharist, Supplem., pp. 5, 6.)

The second is from a letter without date, but written, no doubt, in 1571, just after the 39 Articles had been agreed to in Convocation, and placed before Queen Elizabeth. It is as follows. . . . "Yet for all this to avoid offence and contention the word *onely* may be well left out, as not needful. My L. of Gloucester is pronounced excommunicate by my lord of Canterbury and shall be cited to answer before him, and other bishops to certain errors which he is accused to hold. I think if this word *onely* were put out of the book for his sake it were the best.

"It followeth in the book, But the mean whereby the

body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is faith. If this word *profitably* were put hereunto in this sort, But the mean whereby the body of Christ is *profitably* received and eaten in the supper is faith, then should the occasion of this question, whether the evil do receive Christ's body in the Sacrament, because they lack faith (which riseth of the foresaid words and causeth much strife) should be quite taken away, for that hereby is not denied the *unfruitful* receiving of Christ's body without faith, but the fruitful one affirmed.

"My L. grace of Canterbury is purposed to present to the Queen's Majesty the first copy of the book of Articles (to the which the most part of the bishops have subscribed) to have it authorised by her Majesty, and there is this Article, 'Evil men receive not the body of Christ,' which Article is not in the printed books either in Latin or English. IF THIS ARTICLE BE CONFIRMED and AUTHORISED by the Queen's grace it will cause much business, because it is quite contrary to the Scripture and to the doctrine of the fathers, for it is certain that Judas as evil as he was did receive Christ's body, because Christ said unto him, Take, eat, this is my body." (Quoted from Goode on Eucharist, Suppl., pp. 9, 10.)

These extracts not only throw light on the views of Bishops Geste and Cheney, but also on the relation in which those views were felt to stand towards the Articles of the English Church.

Cheney felt there was for him a *crux* in the 28th Article, which declares that the body and blood of Christ are received *only* after a heavenly and spiritual manner. The *crux* might be removed by the omission of the word "*only*." But Geste had, perhaps, been labouring to get the Article so worded, as at the same time to satisfy the requirements of

the Bishops, and yet in language which Lutherans might (in some sense) accept. And perhaps with this view had inserted that word "only." At any rate, it appears, Geste could let the "only" remain and find in the Article no repudiation of the Lutheran Presence. In discourse therefore with Cheney he had justified the Article and the word "only," declaring that it was his own penning.

And here we see the true wisdom, and vigilance, and care, and (in this matter) the likemindedness to Cranmer, of Archbishop Parker, in that he saw that the 28th Article with all its plain teaching would serve as an insufficient test to exclude those dangerous roots of "the Real Presence." That Article indeed declares that the body of Christ is "given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner:" and that "the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." And it is true that this language exactly described and was, no doubt, intended (though by Geste designed to bear a further sense) to describe, that giving and taking and receiving which belong to the actings of the soul corresponding, in things spiritual and unseen, to the sacramental actions in things outward and visible. But from another point of view they might possibly be accepted by Lutherans. They might possibly be made to endure the pressure which would force a Lutheran sense into them. They might be accepted even by Geste as signifying that the Presence, though conveyed in the Elements, was not cognizable by the senses of the body. If this Article had stood alone, Cheney would have desired, and Geste would have preferred, the word "*only*" omitted, but Geste could have signed it; and Cheney with Geste's explanation might *possibly* have been brought to accept it too.

There needed something more, there needed something more testing yet, to exclude the Real Presence in Luther's sense. And that something Parker desired to supply. And though difficulties and hindrances were set in his way, yet he carried his point, and the 29th Article, which had previously in 1562 been accepted by Convocation, was added to our Articles for avoiding diversities of opinion. And even Geste was now made to feel that a test was applied, which his views, or Cheney's at least, could not stand.

Now, at least, he was constrained to acknowledge, that there was insuperable repugnance between Lutheran views and the declared doctrines of our Church.

It appears then to me to be, for them, a most unfortunate argument, which has been built on the letters of Geste, by those who maintain the Real Objective Presence. If we had not the 29th Article, and if we had only Geste's first letter to Cheney, it might have stood them in good stead. It might have served to show that a mind such as Geste's could find room for Lutherans to sit down on, even in the language of an Article, which to most ears would sound against them.

But as it is, we have another letter from Geste which refers to Article the 29th; and from this it appears, that one who in that day seems to have had the very same tendency as our modern Ritualists, to strain every cord to the uttermost to make room for Lutheran views, felt that now he was overmatched by the wisdom and foresight of Parker—that even he, who could justify the "only" in Article 28th, can do nothing now but strongly condemn the language of Article 29th, because it is too evident, that that Article speaks language which quite unmistakeably condemns the "Real Presence" of Luther. Geste would

not repudiate one word in Article 28; he would claim it all his own, because he would not see his own views, or the views he desired to shelter, repudiated by it.

He rejects and repudiates entirely the teaching of Article 29, because it is plain that he *must* see that the doctrine of the Lutherans is rejected and repudiated by *that*.

Agreement there might be, though some might think it a very forced agreement, between Lutheran views and the words of the 28th Article. But between such views and the words of the 29th Article no agreement could ever be forced.

And I do not see how we could find, or desire to find, stronger evidence than is furnished by Geste's second letter, to the fact—not only that in the theological language of the Reformation the 29th Article *did* NOT *naturally* mean, but also that it *could not* in that language anyhow be *forced into meaning* that which some modern theologians would constrain it to mean.

Bishop Geste asks to have a word inserted in Article 28, that it may not appear to deny reception by the wicked. How clearly does this show that the moot question, in its testing character, is being dealt with! But what does he get in answer to his request? That one word inserted? No. But, instead, an Article *is* inserted, which, by his own shewing, positively and distinctly *states* that very denial which the insertion of that word might (as he hoped) have taken out of the other.

(3) It only remains for me now to deal with the allegation—that the Article *cannot mean* to say that unbelievers do not eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood, because the Article cites the authority of St. Augustine, and St. Au-

gustine believed that evil men do, in the Sacrament, eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood.

To enter into a critical examination of St. Augustine's teaching on the subject of the Eucharist, would lead to a long digression, and one quite unnecessary for our present purpose.

There is reason to think that his writings on this subject have been tampered with, and their sense twisted and turned by interpolation, as ancient writings have too often been tampered with, that they may be brought into harmony with modern Romish developments of doctrine.

Any, indeed, who may be disposed to take it for granted that St. Augustine *did* hold that evil men really receive the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, may be asked to read what Bishop Morton and Bishop Jeremy Taylor have written on this subject, before they allow themselves to come to any such conclusion.

But even suppose the very contrary to be proved, or suppose that modern criticism should lead decisively to the conclusion that many of the *words* quoted in the Article are not really St. Augustine's at all: still the doctrine of our Article would remain untouched and unshaken by any such discoveries.

By all means, let the question of St. Augustine's opinions of this subject be argued fairly, and sifted thoroughly. We acknowledge the importance of the issue in its relation to the Eucharistic controversy, in that branch of it which is concerned with the views of the ancient Fathers. If it can be shewn, let it be shewn, that St. Augustine has been altogether misrepresented. We do not fear the result of the enquiry, if only St. Augustine be allowed to be the interpreter of his own language.

But as regards the question which is before us—the interpretation of our Article—it is plain that we are concerned, not with the doctrine of St. Augustine, but with the doctrine his words are alleged as supporting, or illustrating.

It will not anyways affect the sense of our Article, if any theologian of the English Church should now say, "I am persuaded that it is a mistake to suppose that St. Augustine's views stand opposed to the corporal presence and the oral manducation, and I am prepared to argue the matter; and I think I can make it appear that St. Augustine rather supports than opposes such a view." Even supposing for a moment such a theologian to enter the lists, and to come out of the controversy victorious in the estimation of all; yet the sense of our Article would be untouched by the result. To affect the interpretation of the Article, it must be shown, not only what St. Augustine's views are, but that at the time of the Reformation they were universally felt, and by all confessed, to be clearly and unmistakeably against what we contend for as the natural meaning of our Article. If this could be shown, we should at once acknowledge the serious damage it would inflict on our arguments. But, so long as it is notorious, that the claim to the authority of St. Augustine was set up by the Reformed as declaring for them in opposition to the views of Papists and Lutherans alike—so long as it is a matter of history that this claim, however hotly disputed by some, was (in a kindred point of the controversy) frankly conceded by Luther himself—so long it will be vain to aim at overthrowing the sense of our Article by new investigations of the writings of St. Augustine.

To look at the matter only and exclusively from an English point of view, it must be clear—and, indeed, it is

fair to state that it is admitted by some of our strongest opponents—that what is essential in this enquiry is not what St. Augustine may have meant, but what our Reformers meant—"not what St. Augustine taught, but in what sense the framers of the Article have adopted [or rather moulded] his words as expository of the doctrine of the Church of England."

So that in order, in any degree, to shake our arguments as to the natural sense of the Article, it must be shown, not only (if it can be shown) that St. Augustine's teaching does not support the doctrine contained in the natural sense of the Article, but that our English Reformers did not so understand St. Augustine's teaching.

Let THIS be shewn, and we will admit the force of the argument.

But THIS, so far as I know, none have attempted to shew. And very sure I am, that if any attempt had been made, it would have proved a void and fruitless attempt indeed.

The consensus of our Reformers in denying the reception of the *res sacramenti* by the wicked and unbelievers, is most striking and most significant. We may surely be thankful for the conclusive evidence it affords of the determinate and distinctive character of our English Reformation, under the application of such a decisive test of the doctrine of the Eucharistic presence.

But if *this* is a striking feature in the writings of our Reformers, not less striking is the continual recurrence of an appeal to St. Augustine, and an appeal for this very purpose — that St. Augustine may bear witness to the doctrine they maintained—the denial of the wicked participating at all, or receiving and eating at all—in any *real*

sense—the thing signified by the outward sign or sacrament which they eat to their condemnation.

Of the many examples of this, one—instar omnium—shall be set down here, because it is the testimony of Bishop Jewel, who not only was a member of the Convocation (1562) in which the Article was framed, but had himself to do with finally reviewing and publishing the Article we are considering.

"To come near to the purpose, St. Augustine saith: 'Outwardly they have the Sacrament of Christ's body; but the thing itself (which is Christ's body represented by the Sacrament) inwardly in their hearts they have not. And, therefore, they eat and drink their own judgment.' Here St. Augustine saith, they are guilty, not because they receive, but because they receive not the body of Christ. Mark well these words, M. Harding: they are effectual. The wicked, by St. Augustine's judgment, are guilty, not because they receive, but because they receive not the body of Christ.

Again he (*i.e.*, St. Augustine) saith: 'Whoso abideth not in Christ, nor Christ in him, out of doubt he eateth not spiritually His flesh, nor drinketh His blood; notwithstanding carnally (that is to say, with the bodily mouth) and visibly he do press with his teeth the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; and rather eateth and drinketh (*not Christ's very body and blood, but*) the Sacrament of so great a thing, unto his judgment.' These words, M. Harding, be *so plain, that I cannot imagine what ye should more desire.* They are guilty of the blood of Christ, for that they despise the price wherewith they were saved, not for that they receive it really into their mouth." (Defence of Apology, P.S. Edit., pp. 894, 895.)

Again: "You may not negligently pass over these words, M. Harding: St. Augustine saith plainly: 'The THING itself that is represented by the Sacrament (that is to say, THE VERY BODY OF CHRIST) is *received* of ALL MEN TO LIFE, and of NO MAN TO DESTRUCTION, whosoever shall be partaker of it.' Hereof you must needs conclude against yourself, that the WICKED *receive* NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST." (Ibid., p. 895.)

If need were, many other examples might be adduced of the oft-recurring use which our Reformers made of this testimony of St. Augustine—to the doctrine they so constantly maintained, and which, with a fair light fairly thrown upon it from their writings, it is, I maintain, absolutely impossible for us to doubt, they have embodied in the words and language (so exactly in harmony with their own words and language) of the 29th Article, which has for its title, "Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper," and which has for its declaration that "The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint *Augustine* saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

Author Papers on the
Title Doctrine of Scripture Church

3240

R 7 Pap